

In the President's words, we can now make a "massive effort to save the countryside as a green legacy for tomorrow."

I hope every public official, every businessman, every bird watcher and deer hunter and ice fisherman and plain citizen, will join in this massive effort.

I hope we will each assume our responsibilities as citizens and stop our own littering and defacing of the landscape. I hope we will realize that when we take something out of our bank of natural resources we have to put something back in.

I hope our people will participate in the educational programs which are needed to spread the story of the conservation crisis far and wide. I hope they will support the legislation needed to save our land—good zoning and sanitation ordinances, reasonable regulation of industries to protect the public interest, sensible restraints on billboard construction, a significant investment in buying land and water resources for the enrichment of life in the future.

Most of all, I ask of all Americans a simple recognition of a fact of life.

We can't have everything. Our land cannot be used up and still be the land of our childhood.

The great resources of America—the soil, the timber, the minerals, the wildlife—have sustained us for hundred of years. But now we have got to think about sustaining them. The frontier is gone. If we destroy these rivers and lakes, if we plunder these forests and rip up these mountainsides and foul this air and water, there will be no new green paradise awaiting us over the horizon. If we don't save the America we have today, I don't think we will have another chance.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend John Pauperas, Zion Lutheran Lithuanian Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, of whom is all rule and authority in the world, we bow our heads this day of the 47th anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania, thanking Thee for the precious gift of freedom which this country with Thine help could enjoy, recognizing the responsibilities placed upon all of us by Thy word: "Unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required."

Help us to share our unnumbered blessings with those who are in need and are suffering wherever they may be. Give encouragement to the suppressed and deprived of liberties and national freedom. Center the vision of this country and of all nations for a deep appreciation for the blessings which are shared in a land where freedom and liberties are preserved.

Keep us spiritually strong to contribute to uphold the faith for freedom of those who are tested being themselves deprived of those liberties we cherish in this country.

May the Holy Spirit fill us with determination to dedicate ourselves to promote that righteousness which exalts a nation. Encourage us to testify boldly to Thy compassion, and fortify us to resist evil. Support the international meetings designed to avoid war and preserve peace with justice.

We ask Thee, Ruler of individuals and of nations, to guide the President and the Congress of the United States. Endow them with wisdom and courage to do that which pleases Thee.

Continue, O Lord, our God, to bless this country with God-fearing statesmen who, guided by Thy word, will spurn every compromise with powers seeking to abolish faith in Thee and are hurting the cause of justice and peace.

We command this country and all the peoples and nations fearing Thy holy name into Thine sustaining power through Jesus, our never failing helper and Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, if he can give us any information as to any further legislative matters this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, and pursuant to the announcement made last week that there would be a further announcement of legislative business, tomorrow H.R. 2998, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act will be programed; and on Thursday, H.R. 45, the Inter-American Development Bank Act, will be called up.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

### HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to notify the House that I have a special order today for 1 hour at which time I am going to discuss the problem of health care for the aged which has been under consideration and remains under consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means.

### INVESTIGATION AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to call up a number of resolutions providing authority for committees to subpoena witnesses and hold investigations.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 35) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 35

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; and the administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions which impede the free flow of air commerce; promotion of travel and tourism; routes, rates, accounts, and subsidy payments; airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace, aircraft, and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; air navigational aids and traffic control; and the administration by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency of the statutes which they administer;

(3) Allocation of radio spectrum; pay television; ownership, control, and operations of communications and related facilities; policies with respect to competition among various modes of communication, including voice and record communications and data processing; policies with respect to governmental communications systems; coordination of communication policies both domestic and foreign; impact of foreign operations, international agreements, and international organizations on domestic and foreign communications; technical developments in the communications field; and the administration by the Federal Communications Commission and the Director of Telecommunications Management of statutes which they administer;

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various Securities Acts; and the administration of the Securities and Exchange Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission, and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel processes; regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies; and the administration by the Federal Power Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling; and the administration by the Fed-

eral Trade Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; and the operations of the Weather Bureau;

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; and other matters relating to public health; and the operations of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission;

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials;

(12) Increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States during recent years; factors responsible for such increase, the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for increased safety on the highways.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, after line 15, add the following paragraphs:

"Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in

section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriate funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and inquire at this time whether he has any desire to consume any time on this particular resolution?

Mr. SMITH of California. No time on this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 80 pertaining to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 80

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies as required in connection with bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to it, and, more specifically or in addition thereto, in connection with the following matters within its jurisdiction:

(1) (a) The status, progress, and administration of irrigation, reclamation, and other water resources development programs of the Department of the Interior and of other agencies insofar as the latter affect the work of the Department of the Interior with respect to such programs, including (i) policies and procedures relating to such programs, (ii) projects previously authorized, (iii) projects proposed for authorization and construction, and (iv) developments under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act; (b) compacts relating to the apportionment of interstate waters; (c) the application to Federal agencies and activities of State laws governing the control, appropriation, and distribution of water; and (d) the saline water research and development program.

(2) (a) The administration and operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws, in-

cluding those which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of oil, gas, and associated resources of the public and other Federal lands; (b) mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including the conditions, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; (c) mineral resources surveys and the exploration, development, production, and conservation of mineral resources; (d) research facilities needed to improve the position of the domestic mining and minerals industries; (e) capability of mining schools to support research facilities and assure domestic industry of a continuing source of technical talent; (f) proposed long-range domestic minerals programs, including availability of domestic minerals to fulfill all domestic requirements; (g) impact upon domestic mining industries caused by the transfer or disposal of excess and surplus Government-owned metals and minerals; and (h) the effects upon domestic mining industries resulting from the world metal situation and the means available to the Government to permit domestic mining industries to compete favorably in domestic and world markets, including cooperation with established international organizations.

(3) (a) The status, progress, and administration of the national park system and its units, including national seashores, national riverways, and national recreation areas, and of other recreational developments on public domain lands or reservations created out of the public domain and on areas under the jurisdiction of or affecting the Department of the Interior; (b) national outdoor recreation plans and the administration of the land and water conservation fund; and (c) national cemeteries.

(4) (a) The administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of public lands administered by the Department of the Interior, of forest reserves created out of the public domain and of areas of the Outer Continental Shelf; (b) administration and operation of the National Wilderness Preservation Act; and (c) the withdrawal or restriction on use of public domain or Outer Continental Shelf lands, including reservations created out of the public domain, by military and nonmilitary agencies of the Government from normal operation of the public land and mining laws, and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(5) (a) The administration of Indian affairs by agencies of the Government participating therein, the programs and policies of those agencies, the adequacy of existing Indian legislation, and the effectiveness with which it is being administered and with which moneys available to carry out its purposes are being used; (b) the release of Indian tribes and bands from Federal supervision, preparation therefor, and the effects thereof; (c) the availability to Indians of health, education, and welfare services and the extent to which they are receiving the full benefit of Federal programs in these areas; (d) the utilization of tribal land and other resources, with particular attention to the means of developing the skill and aptitudes required for such utilization; and (e) the study and analysis of treaties and other written agreements between recognized Indian tribes, nations, or bands and the United States.

(6) The status, progress, and administration of the territories and insular possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including particularly the status of Puerto Rico and revision of the Commonwealth Act of 1952; the operation and administration of the Revised Virgin Islands Organic Act of



1954, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act of 1949, and Guam Organic Act of 1950, all as amended; local conditions bearing upon and the provisions to be included in organic Acts for American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the extension of various laws of the United States to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the granting of citizenship to residents of American Samoa; problems concerning the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands; and national interests in Antarctica.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of making such investigations and studies, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit, hold hearings, and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States as the nature of the investigation of study requires, and be represented at any meeting called by an established international organization to consider matters that affect the areas of jurisdiction of the committee; may do so not only during the session but also during periods of recess and adjournment; and may require, by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for overseas travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 6, delete lines 11 to 15, inclusive, with the exception of the word "*Provided*," in line 11, delete line 16 through the word "*Budget*;" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964;".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] desires to consume any time on this particular resolution, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish simply to say in this connection on this particular committee I think the language of subsection (b), line 21 of page 3, is a new and desirable field in which this committee would like to operate. That represents the only change from such authorization of 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we support the resolution and urge its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS COMING WITHIN ITS COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 94 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 94

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 4, 1965, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation relating to all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 14, add the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Com-

mittee on Education and Labor for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, there have been complaints about the expenditure of foreign funds that are in foreign countries to the credit of the United States without authority of the Congress. The amendment to this resolution provides that no Member traveling without authority of the Congress shall be entitled to use counterpart funds in other countries.

I know of no objection to this bill.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this means, I assume, that if counterpart funds are spent by members of the committee traveling in foreign countries they must be reported through the processes required by the House?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. That is provided by law.

Mr. GROSS. But they can spend counterpart funds?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any counterpart funds in Puerto Rico?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not aware of where the counterpart funds are. They are stuck around in a lot of pockets, but I do not know where.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if there are any in Puerto Rico.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 112 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 112

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in or related to the fields of astronautical research and development (including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities), outer space (including exploration and control thereof, and air and space law), and other scientific research and development (including international scientific cooperation) coming within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is

authorized to sit and act within or without the United States, during the present Congress, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its studies, investigations, and inquiries, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for overseas travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, lines 4 to 9, inclusive, delete (1) and insert the following: "That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964;"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment which has just been read, and which probably no one was able to hear because of the conversation and confusion in the Chamber, provides that in the use of counterpart funds where they are authorized to be used the rate of subsistence and use of the funds therefor is subject to the same restrictions provided for in the Mutual Security Act, which is the uniform subsistence allowance now provided for the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the United States took another giant stride in the exploration of space. At 9:37 a.m. a Saturn rocket—this is the one designed to carry our people into orbit and to the moon—with its 1,500,000 pounds of thrust, lifted off the launch pad at Cape Kennedy, Fla., on a mission to place in orbit around the earth the Pegasus satellite.

This was the eighth launch of the Saturn rocket out of eight attempts, a truly outstanding scientific and engineering accomplishment of the men of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and of the many contractors who worked so long and hard to make this event a success.

The Pegasus satellite, which will orbit the earth about 97 minutes, is expected to range in altitude from 310 to 465 statute miles and is inclined 31.7 degrees to the equator.

It will, by means of large panels extended out to 96 by 14 feet and having more than 2,400 square feet of instrumented surface, sweep space to detect and report collision with meteoroids and other minute particles.

I am sure the Members will be excited to learn that this is a textbook shot. The latest information I have is that all launch systems worked perfectly.

The satellite has been deployed, and its internal systems are functioning at peak efficiency.

It is my understanding that later this afternoon I will receive confirmation of the receipt of the first data transmitted from the satellite to earth.

For me, this great accomplishment is very satisfying.

It is another validation, along the long hard road of technical decisions over the past 6 years or more, of the many critical choices that had to be made by the leaders of our space program.

This is another factor contributing to the increased confidence we should have in the rightness of the course we have been following in exploring space.

I may say that the gratifying success of the Saturn booster has been matched in other programs as well.

I need only point to the Tiros weather satellite.

Nine have been launched out of nine attempts.

I think we have every right to be proud of our space team on this day of outstanding achievement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California's

yielding to me. I should also like to comment on the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], with regard to the remarkable space exploit that has taken place. I join with him in particular pride because that exploratory satellite has been produced and is the brain child of a Maryland corporation, the Fairchild Hiller Corp., which is making a great contribution to the space program of America.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER. I am very happy this is so. I just want to say that the space effort is distributed far and wide in this country. We are happy to use the best brains of the country, be they North, South, East, or West, in putting up these satellites.

Mr. MATHIAS. I agree with the gentleman. The Fairchild Hiller Corp. has major installations in Hagerstown and Rockville in my district in Maryland. I have been personally familiar with the great effort that both management and the highly skilled men and women of this company have exerted to excel in the field of space technology. Their achievement today justifies both their own hard work and the confidence that we all have in them.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I would like specifically to call the attention of the membership to the language in this resolution on page 3 which is new amended language.

My understanding is that this came about last year because this particular language was placed in the mutual security bill. So the committees that have been authorized here or will be authorized to do foreign travel—the Space Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and, I believe, Interstate and Foreign Commerce—those will have language that should be used in these particular measures in the future. Of the committees not authorized, as time will go on, they will have special projects and probably are going to come before the Rules Committee and ask for special authority to go to some particular place. I would suggest that you look at this language and keep it in mind because you will want that language if you are given specific authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I approve of the legislation and urge its adoption.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION OF PROCUREMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 118) and ask for its immediate consideration.



The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 118

*Resolved*, That effective from January 4, 1965, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of material, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense;

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services; and

(6) all other matters within the legislative jurisdiction conferred by law or the Rules of the House of Representatives upon the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, after line 3, add the following: "Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Govern-

ment, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 133) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 133

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to all matters falling within the jurisdiction of the committee under rule XI(4) of the Rules of the House of Representatives or any law of the United States.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it considers advisable, during the present Congress.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States (including its Commonwealths and possessions), or outside the United States in connection with matters involving international organizations, international finance, balance of payments problems, export control matters or operation of the Export-Import Bank, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned; to hold such hearings and require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof designated by him, may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 7, delete the words "or outside the United States".

On an additional page numbered "3", show the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Banking and Currency for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 141) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 141

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the United States and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, water-power, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States and Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Funds authorized for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Public Works for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CREATING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 13) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 13

*Resolved*, That, effective January 4, 1965, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of thirteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled

in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and (4) to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided*, That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

SEC. 3. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such reports as it deems advisable and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as the committee deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 5. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution on behalf of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 2, strike out the word "thirteen" and insert the word "fifteen."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 3, strike out "or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member." and insert "or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or members."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, after line 12, insert "Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754(b) of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the calendar year 1965 a sum not in excess of \$250,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to committee amendment: On page 3, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some considerable controversy between the Committee on Rules and various legislative committees and select committees in regard to the authorization of funds for the use of the committee. We thought in the Committee on Rules, after discussing this matter at some length, that there ought to be some limitation by way of authorization on the funds that were being used by these various and sundry committees. We proceeded to do just that. The chairmen of the various committees felt that the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on House Administration felt that they should have the authority both to authorize and to appropriate funds, which seemed to us a little unusual.

Well, we did not think in the Committee on Rules, after mature consideration, that this matter was of great enough importance to cause a big ruckus in the House amongst the Committee on Rules and the chairmen of the legislative committees. After some consideration and one or two votes on the subject, our Committee on Rules voted to strike out the committee amendments that limited the funds that these committees should spend. We did not do this without some consideration. I do not think there is any hard feeling left about it, because after all, we did recede from our previous position. We did obtain the figures in regard to the amount of the expenditures and how these expenditures had increased over the years for these select committees and all of the standing committees. I have the figures with regard to this here. We went back to the 83d Congress to see how much we had been spending for various and sundry investigations all over the face of the earth, with the exception of the North and South Poles, I think, and we found in the 83d Congress that there was a little over \$2 million expended for that purpose.

Now, year by year this figure has gone up, and I am just going to give you these figures because maybe the Committee on House Administration in the light of the great increase in what this business of investigation is costing, might feel it is appropriate to run a little closer watch on how much money is being spent here, yonder, and the other place, and they might reduce it some. For that reason I am making this statement.

In the 83d Congress there were \$2,689,000 spent on the subject of investigations. All of this is in addition to the staff that each standing committee is allowed, which is quite an elaborate staff, as you all know. This is in addition to that.

In the 84th Congress the figure went up to \$3.5 million. In the 85th Congress the expenditure went up to \$4,784,000. In the 86th Congress it went up to \$5,797,000. In the 87th Congress it went up to \$6,724,000. Now, in the 88th Congress, that is, the last Congress, this expenditure went up to \$8,112,000. In other words, it has gone up \$1 million a year. The budgets that I have seen and that are proposed indicate it is going to go up some more this year.

We have had a great many lectures on balancing the budget. The President has told us that we ought to decrease expenses wherever it was necessary. We thought we were doing a useful job and I still think so. I think we are spending too much money on staff for investigations. Some committees are noted for their large expenditures. We have one committee that has spent over \$1 million a year for additional staff to conduct investigations.

Mr. Speaker, we have withdrawn from this and I thought it desirable at least to make this explanation. We have no apology to make for what we did, but in the light of the position taken by the chairmen of the various committees we felt that the matter should be dropped for the time being and just express the hope that somewhere along the line somebody may pay a little attention to the amount of expenditures for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, that is all the statement I have to make on the subject; and at this time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. This is a select committee which we have to reorganize as soon as possible because otherwise the members of the staff will not get paid. They will not be paid until such time as we do pass the resolution.

I hope to be reappointed to this Select Committee on Small Business and if so at the first meeting I intend to bring up the subject of investigation of foundations. I think the committee has done a very, very fine job in many fields. I think the staff is doing excellent work. But I think we have reached the point now where this investigation of foundations is going too far. I want to make these remarks part of the Record at this time, but from here on I shall make my remarks in the committee itself where it can be discussed in executive session.



Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by stating to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Small Business that I hope we can wind up this foundations investigation and not keep it going ad infinitum. I hope we can do that in this session of the Congress.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and also the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], for the very kind way and fair manner in which they have treated this committee and for the consideration of the amendments that have been proposed. These amendments have my approval and have been approved by other members of the committee.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was curious about the language on page 3 which says that local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or employees traveling abroad. Is there a provision also in the resolution which would make such U.S.-owned currencies available?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this language is restrictive language in connection with committees that are not basically authorized to travel abroad. If the gentleman has checked the resolution that we passed with reference to the Committee on Foreign Affairs he will find language in there which is identical with the language in the Mutual Security Act passed last year which is required language covering the amount of money going abroad. The Small Business Committee is not authorized to travel abroad. They would have to come to the Committee on Rules and get special authority of the House if they had any problem abroad that they wished to investigate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Am I correct in assuming the gentleman is not opposing the continuation of the foundation's study during the 89th Congress? He merely expresses the hope that we can wind it up entirely during this 89th Congress?

Mr. SMITH of California. I would say to the gentleman that basically that is probably a reasonably fair statement. But I will have more to say about this in the committee.

I want the gentleman from Texas to know that I shall have more to say about this when we organize. It depends upon how far we are going. If we are going to go back and get all kinds of records as far back as 1942, 1943, or 1944, we will have a problem. If the foundations are bad, I want to have them investigated thoroughly, I say this to the gentleman

from Texas, and I shall cooperate in every way possible. But I do not think we ought to pester some of these good foundations and get all of their records, more records and more records.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, the one thing I wanted to make plain is the fact that the gentleman is not opposed to it for the 89th Congress? He just expresses the hope that it will be finished during the 89th Congress?

Mr. SMITH of California. I certainly do.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Do I understand the gentleman correctly when he says it is the intention of the Rules Committee that only those committees not authorized overseas travel be required to use American dollars in their travels overseas, but those committees which desire to travel overseas can come before the Rules Committee and get this authority and then expend counterpart funds?

Mr. SMITH of California. That is the language, I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana. But on the first statement which the gentleman made I do not think that is quite the requirement, that you have to use American money, I do not believe that is true. The Appropriations Committee does, but on this particular language it is awfully difficult for me to explain what that language really means. But, the intention as I understand it was to cover all those that are authorized to go abroad will go under the same language which was placed in the mutual security bill last year. Those not authorized to go abroad in their investigative tasks are confined to this language, unless they ask to go abroad and then they are granted funds. Then, the other language will go in.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules for a further explanation of the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that does require a little explanation. It was the thought of the Committee on Rules that a committee, either a legislative committee or a special committee, has authority to make an investigation and travel abroad for that purpose, if they are duly authorized under a resolution, then we would want to use the counterpart funds wherever they are available in foreign countries. But if someone goes to Europe, whether it is a group or a single Member of Congress, and has no legislative authority to travel abroad in behalf of the Congress, then he should not use counterpart funds, and from where he gets the money is his business.

Mr. WAGGONER. If the gentleman from California will yield further, if I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules correctly, this limitation only applies to those committees where a committee member travels without legislative authority?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman from California will yield further to me, yes; without a resolution authorizing foreign travel.

Mr. WAGGONER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I might say that there are one or two other committees, like the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, which have special funds for that purpose.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that no member of the House Small Business Committee has traveled abroad on funds provided by this committee. We did not use funds for this purpose last year and we do not intend to use them for this purpose during this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that no one was pointing any finger to any particular committee.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Wherein you say, "the funds authorized for expenses incurred for these activities within the United States," would that in any way bar the using of money in Puerto Rico or any of our possessions?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Puerto Rico is under the domination of the United States.

Mr. DENT. And for the purposes of this act is considered a proper expenditure.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I suppose so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. First, let me say I am very much in favor of what the gentleman is saying. The question is this: Would the use of these counterpart funds assist us in our balance-of-payments situation? I think it would. I was wondering whether the use of counterpart funds would assist us in a small way in our balance-of-payments problem. I think it would, but I am not too clear. Did the gentleman go into that at all?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As I understand the balance-of-payments situation anything that takes dollars out of this country and sends them to another country hurts the balance-of-payments situation. Anything that takes dollars out of other countries and brings them to this country assists us.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is a little more complicated because these are in effect credits. I do not know that it creates balance of payments before these funds are spent. That was the one thing that was not clear in my mind in trying to think the matter through.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not sure I understand what the gentleman has in mind. If he means counterpart funds, of course, they have no direct effect themselves upon balance of payments.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that would be true, using that in lieu of actual money that would come from the United States,



which would certainly hurt us. I think this would to that extent benefit us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Having liberated \$5 billion in gold, I understand that the junketing Members of Congress would carry gold over there to get around this.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, gold is not used as currency in this country.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with a question raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], concerning an investigation by the Small Business Committee into foundations, I do not want anything that I say to be construed as being a concurrence in what has been said heretofore. The gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from California if he had any objection to his continuing that investigation in the 89th Congress.

I just want to say that I objected to it having ever been considered or started; I think the gentleman ought to have concluded it, and I do not think he ought to go any further with it. The Small Business Committee was never created for that purpose. It has been engaged in a very elaborate investigation of things that had nothing in the world to do with small business, in my judgment.

As a matter of fact, I am informed that the Treasury Department under direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, which committee has jurisdiction over this subject, has conducted a long, a thorough, and a complete examination of the subject of "Foundations," an examination which, in my judgment, was very badly needed for a long time. They have now reported to the Committee on Ways and Means, and that committee, I hope, is about to make its own investigation which will result in correction of the many evils that were being engaged in by these foundations that were set up, some of them for the purpose of dodging or evading or avoiding taxes.

I merely make that statement because I think it is a subject that needs consideration, but I do not like to see one committee assuming the functions of another committee that is doing the job, and that is authorized to do it.

I thought I should make this statement for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. May I say to the gentleman and assure Members of the House that the committee has made a most worthwhile investigation; that we have reported to the Congress; that our committee has turned the reports over to the Internal Revenue Service and to the Congress. The Internal Revenue Service has commended the work of the committee in this area.

The Committee on Ways and Means will take it from here, and doubtless there will be some legislation following the investigation and report by the House Committee on Small Business on the subject of lax practices by some foundations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then you have completed your investigation?

Mr. EVINS. The Subcommittee on Foundations has made no recommendations. We have merely made an investigation. We have the facts available, we have reported to the Congress, although there are no recommendations contained in the report. As recommendations have been made, the job is not really completed, and we certainly hope to finish the matter this year. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that our committee hopes to conclude this matter during this Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That was not my hope. My hope was that you would go back to small business and let the Ways and Means Committee do its own work.

Mr. EVINS. We have conferred with the Ways and Means Committee, and they said they did not have the staff or the time to pursue the matter. They concurred in the Small Business Committee conducting the investigation. I again assure the gentleman that I am in agreement with him that this work should be completed during this Congress.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House resolution 13, 89th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business, the following Members of the House: Mr. Evins, of Tennessee, chairman; Mr. Patman, of Texas; Mr. Multer, of New York; Mr. Steed, of Oklahoma; Mr. Roosevelt, of California; Mr. Kluczynski, of Illinois; Mr. Dingell, of Michigan; Mr. Smith, of Iowa; Mr. Weltner, of Georgia; Mr. Moore, of West Virginia; Mr. Smith, of California; Mr. Harvey, of Indiana; Mr. Conte, of Massachusetts; Mr. Broyhill, of North Carolina; Mr. Horton, of New York.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 19 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 4, 1965, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in territories and possessions;

(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act; and

(6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure; and

(7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; and *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 18, change the period to a semicolon and add the word "and" and add another subsection as follows: "(8) relating to State taxation of interstate commerce."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 22, insert: "For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the calendar year 1965 a sum not in excess of \$250,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned about the deprivation of voting rights. We are faced with an intolerable situation in Mississippi and now in Selma, Ala. I certainly believe legislation in this area is essential.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary what plans the committee has to hold hearings and



to recommend further legislation to insure the right of all American citizens to vote.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that reasoning and reasonable men deplore some of these excesses that we read about in certain sections of the country and view with alarm some of the mischief that is going on. I think it is incumbent upon the Committee on the Judiciary which has full and ample legislative power to address itself to this matter. I assure the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary will take hold of this situation and most expeditiously endeavor to formulate legislation that might meet these various issues developing in the South.

It might be interesting for the gentleman to know that I have been in touch with the office of the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, in particular, and his civil rights division. They are very much disturbed over the matter and they are working on suggested legislation. I hope to have a report from the Department of Justice momentarily. There are quite a number of bills that have been offered, and I think it is incumbent upon the Committee on the Judiciary to act upon them. I can assure the gentleman that that action will be expeditious.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I certainly do hope and urge that there be immediate legislation in the area of voting rights which I believe should include the abolition of literacy and constitutional interpretation tests and, secondly, the establishment of a system of Federal registrars to register voters where there has been a deprivation of voting rights. State and local, as well as Federal elections must be covered. This can be accomplished by legislation under the 14th and 15th amendments without any constitutional amendment. Also section 2 of the 14th amendment, providing for the reduction in the basis of representation in Congress when the right to vote is denied or abridged, has never been enforced, and it should be. Congress has a direct responsibility to insure the franchise for all Americans.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether it was the first committee amendment on page 2, line 19, that was withdrawn or the second committee amendment on page 3, line 22 or whether both amendments were withdrawn by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The first committee amendment on page 2 was agreed to and the amendment on page 3 is the amendment that was withdrawn.

Mr. HALL. The amendment on page 2 was agreed to?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct, and the amendment on page 3 was withdrawn.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the gentleman to yield in order to make an inquiry as to the language on page 2, paragraph (8) with reference to the amendment relating to State taxation of interstate commerce. If the gentleman understands what that means, I would like to know.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who proposed the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. The reason I ask the question is that we have been requested to go into certain matters having to do with interstate commerce insofar as taxation in the railroad industry is concerned. We had that problem last year. The committee had been looking into this problem and, consequently, we did not pursue it. But at a later time, I did talk to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], about it and apparently he took the position at that time that your committee could not pursue the matter. We had legislation on the subject. We were in a crossfire, so to speak, and hardly knew just what to do about it. We did hold a brief hearing on the legislation that was introduced and referred to our committee.

I am merely trying to get the jurisdictional situation straightened out, so I will know what to expect.

Mr. CELLER. We have acted under Public Law 272 of the 86th Congress. That was a result of conferences had with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and myself. I believe we did consult the gentleman, also. You may not recall.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I believe we had one or two meetings with the Ways and Means Committee, your committee and my committee, to discuss the matter.

Mr. CELLER. They all sort of dumped it, if I may use that colloquial expression, into our laps. We did not seek it.

Senator BYRD, in particular, wanted the Judiciary Committee to handle it.

I cleared with all committees. We have been working under the aegis of the very able gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ED WILLIS, since the 86th Congress. The report will be ready shortly, and recommendations for legislation will be made. They probably will be referred to the gentleman's committee or to my committee; I do not know which. I assure the gentleman that there will be no deliberate overlapping of any jurisdiction.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume that under this arrangement, carrying out the spirit of the authorization language as well as the letter, should we receive proposed legislation and should it be referred to our committee, we could appropriately

wait until the gentleman's committee has completed whatever study it will make on the subject.

Mr. CELLER. We have that in mind. I assure the gentleman that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] also has that in mind. If this is a matter before the gentleman's committee, I assure him that we would relinquish jurisdiction. In fact, we would not have jurisdiction, but he would have it. We will work in closest harmony in every respect.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly, I wish to cooperate with the gentleman, but I did not wish to get involved in the dilemma faced the last time, when we were in it and not in it. I wish to be sure how to handle it this time.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 233, Report No. 49), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2998) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 234, Report No. 50), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 45) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking

and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION AND STUDY BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 44) and ask for its immediate consideration; and, pending that, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I withdraw the amendment printed on page 3, lines 4, 5, and 6.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following:

(1) The organization, management, operation, and administration of any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia; and

(2) The organization, management, operation, and administration of any independent agency or instrumentality of government operating solely in the District of Columbia.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on the District of Columbia for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: on page 1, line 2, after the word "authorized", strike out the words "and directed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TO AUTHORIZE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 68 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, nursing home care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation); and

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances; with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs.

The committee is also authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contributions is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fundraising activities conducted by organizations chartered by Act of Congress in the name of veterans is necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether or not

the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary, except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any members designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754(b) of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 84 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under



the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by any agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SMITH of California (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 89 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective January 4, 1965, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the disposal of agricultural surpluses pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements upon United States agriculture;

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general

public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies;

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers;

(5) The formulation and development of improved price support and regulatory programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities;

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees;

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; and the development of land use programs pursuant to titles I and IV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962;

(8) All other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any members thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, after line 3, add the following paragraphs:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the calendar year 1965 a sum not in excess of \$75,000."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 4, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WEST GERMANY BOWS TO BLACKMAIL

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that the West German Government permitted itself to be intimidated by a would-be Hitler in reversing its policy of furnishing Israel with the balance of armaments as per their agreement.

It seems as though the Bonn government is experiencing a good deal of difficulty in cleansing itself of the stench of Auschwitz. I view with alarm the trend of the German Government in yielding to Nazi-minded advice. First we find the Nazi scientist aiding Egypt in building terrible weapons of destruction directed against Israel. Then it allows its statute of limitations against Nazi murderers to expire, and now it refuses to honor its arms agreement with Israel.

The guts of what was once a great power in Europe are turning to sawdust. By submitting to Nasser, the Germans are exposing their Achilles heel, leaving themselves wide open to international blackmail. Shame.

I offer an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, February 15:

#### BOWING TO BLACKMAIL

Both as a political and symbolic matter, West Germany's decision to cancel arms shipments to Israel is highly unfortunate. President Nasser had threatened to recognize East Germany if Bonn did not terminate an arms agreement with Israel. With inglorious alacrity, West Germany collapsed before this blackmail threat and put herself in the wrong with a nation that above all others deserves sympathetic consideration from Germany.

The amount of money involved was relatively modest. West Germany has never officially disclosed her arms agreement with Israel, but the total amount is believed to be \$60 million and it is estimated that 80 percent of the deliveries have already been made. But if the amount was small, the principle was large.

In diplomacy as in common crime, blackmailers have an insatiable thirst. Mr. Nasser was able to dictate Bonn's foreign policy by a verbal threat and by inviting Walter Ulbricht, head of the East German regime, to Cairo for a visit. Having surrendered once, West Germany may be asked to take other steps adverse to Israel in order to prevent possible recognition of East Germany.

As a symbolic matter, Bonn's position is an unhappy one. It may be that West Germany has done much to provide material compensation for wartime atrocities, and no doubt Bonn cannot be expected to condition every aspect of its foreign policy to the mem-

ory of a haunted past. Still, it is true that Germany is tailoring her policies to the demand of an Egyptian dictator who has sworn to destroy the nation of Israel. Such is the truth, no matter how it is rationalized in Germany.

**Mr. YATES.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

**Mr. YATES.** Mr. Speaker, last week I voted for the amendment which would prohibit the Public Law 480 expenditures of \$37 million for surplus agricultural commodities to go to the United Arab Republic. I voted against such expenditures, not because I am opposed to giving surplus food to the impoverished, hungry people of the United Arab Republic, for the contrary is true. But I voted as I did because I am opposed to expanding the prestige and world position of United Arab Republic's dictator, Gamal Abdel Nasser. His actions do not justify any confidence in the possibility that he seeks to build peace and stability in the Middle East, nor is there any indication that he wants to associate himself and his country with the United States in its efforts to build world peace. The long list of his activities in opposition to our policies was thoroughly discussed in the debate and needs no repetition at this time.

I do not believe there is any question but that the final vote on that amendment was considered a triumph for Nasser. Now comes news of another victory for him with the surrender by the West German Government to his demand that it cancel its contract to furnish weapons and defense materiel to Israel. This occurrence marks the latest example of Nasser's skill as a dealer in pressure politics. It marks a significant loss, as well, in the prestige of the West German Government.

Mr. Speaker, peace is on a see-saw in the Middle East. As Nasser is inflated by the surrender to his demands by other governments, the prospects for peace go down correspondingly. Each of his triumphs increases the tensions in the Middle East and one wonders, Mr. Speaker, what his new claims will be.

We have learned time and again that dictators cannot be satisfied; that their demands are endless. We must stop inflating Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I attach an article which appeared in the New York Times of February 16, 1965:

#### BONN'S MIDEAST MUDDLE

The West Germans have made an almost incredible mess of the linked issues of arms to Israel and relations with Egypt. As a result, President Nasser has been greatly strengthened; tensions in the already tense Middle East have risen; West German relations with Israel, which had improved so greatly in recent years, have again sunk to a low of bitterness and anger; and Communist East Germany, Bonn's enemy, achieves a triumph.

It may have been an error on Chancellor Adenauer's part to make the \$80 million arms agreement with Israel in 1960, but, once made, there was no excuse not to go through

with it. Israel's perennially dangerous position, surrounded as she is by Arab nations determined to destroy her, meant that she needed arms to sustain what Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel yesterday called "a balance of deterrence." However, the arms could have been obtained elsewhere.

Another basic error has been Bonn's persistence in the "Hallstein Doctrine" of not dealing with any nation that recognizes East Germany. This has proved to be more of a nuisance in recent years than an asset, and it has by no means been strictly honored.

President Nasser all along demanded that Germany cease her arms shipments to Israel, but he got nowhere until he had the bold idea of inviting East Germany's President Ulbricht to Egypt as a state guest. Bonn objected that this was de facto recognition and made the egregious error of trying to buy off Mr. Nasser by halting the arms shipments to Israel. This crude maneuver had no effect on the Egyptians. President Ulbricht is going to Cairo anyway, and he will get red-carpet treatment.

Now Germany threatens to cutoff economic aid to Egypt if the Ulbricht visit is carried out. Such aid amounted to nearly \$200 million during the first 5-year plan. However, President Nasser has proved in the past that he is allergic to dictation based on aid.

Meanwhile, supplies of Russian arms to Egypt and the other Arab countries have been increasing. The Israelis have a right to be profoundly disturbed as well as angry by the loss of the remainder of the arms—some \$20 million worth—which they expected from Germany.

The whole affair has been an ignominious defeat for West Germany, but it has also raised the danger level in the Middle East. Southeast Asia and the Congo are not the only parts of the world where war is possible.

#### DICTATORS CANNOT BE APPEASED

**Mr. ROSENTHAL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. MULTER.** Mr. Speaker, editorials throughout the country are commenting upon the fact that the little dictator on the Nile has frightened West Germany.

The world long since should have learned that dictators cannot be appeased.

Because of Nasser's threat to recognize East Germany, the Bonn government in West Germany has now broken her solemn agreement with the State of Israel and has announced that she will sell no more arms to the State of Israel. Israel will get along without these arms, but West Germany cannot get along without the respect of the free world which she is now losing.

What is worse for West Germany is that even Nasser shows his total lack of respect and even his contempt for West Germany. Having exacted a promise from West Germany to break its solemn obligation, the little dictator now goes right ahead with all of his plans to play footsie with East Germany.

Blackmail, whether private or international, is criminal, and those who submit to it become parties to the crime.

#### POSITIVE STEPS TO PREVENT CRIME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

**Mr. BENNETT.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

**Mr. BENNETT.** Mr. Speaker, we have talked too long with too little action about the basic problems of crime and juvenile delinquency, gnawing at the very basic roots of our Nation's moral and ethical fiber. Today I am introducing three bills which I believe will help to halt crime, delinquency, violence in the streets, and adult apathy in their tracks. We must take at least these positive steps to reduce crime in America.

The President, in his state of the Union message, challenged Congress to do something about this, and my bills will alert the American people to what Federal Bureau of Investigation Director, J. Edgar Hoover, says "is an urgent need for community leadership to get behind local law enforcement officials by lending their influence and undivided support to police efforts to control and prevent crime."

The greatest need in American life today is a "safe society," and no one will dispute this. The facts about the crime rate are at our fingertips: Crime in the United States increased 13 percent during the first 9 months of 1964 when compared to the same period in 1963.

Legislation by the Congress, quickly acted upon, can stem this tide.

My bills propose to:

First. Call for a White House Conference on Crime Prevention and Juvenile Delinquency.

This conference would be made up of Federal and local officials, representatives of colleges, institutions, and organizations interested in this problem. It would discuss methods of preventing crime and delinquency, including the basic problem of youth employment; adult apathy to crime as was witnessed by the recent incident where neighbors of the late Kitty Genovese ignored her repeated cries for help, which left her dead of multiple stab wounds on her doorstep, and the growing group defiance of law and order leading to mob violence. National attention would be focused on this conference and, I am certain, constructive legislation and administrative recommendations would be made.

Second. Establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime.

This Commission would recognize that crime, particularly in its organized aspects, has become increasingly a matter of vital concern to the Nation. The Commission would be composed of seven members, five to be named by the President, and two would be ex officio members, the Attorney General and the Director of the FBI. The Commission would make a full, complete, and continuing study of investigation in the several elements of interstate crime and be adequately staffed to carry on these studies and investigations.



Third. Provide grants for college level instruction in modern methods of crime detection, control, and prevention.

This would complement the FBI's National Academy, and make such instruction available for a much larger number of officers than is now possible. Further, grants to the National Institutes of Health and other research institutions would be made to determine the causes and cures for various types of criminal behavior.

The prime responsibility in the prevention of crime and juvenile delinquency, which costs the country annually \$27 billion, rests with the local and State Governments, but it is a national responsibility, too, in that each American must personally become interested in the complete eradication of crime. My legislation would provide the vehicles for bringing national attention to this problem of making for a safe society.

It is important to understand the criminal mind, and how to cure it. It is important to discover crimes and to prevent them; and this legislation I have introduced will serve us in all these fields.

#### RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call to the attention of the House a problem of serious concern to every citizen of the United States. A full-page advertisement in the Washington Post on February 3, 1965, took the form of an open letter to the President of the United States urging the Chief Executive to abolish completely existing controls on the importation of foreign residual fuel oil.

Although this arbitrary action was urged upon the President in the interest of "free and open competition," the advertisement was signed and paid for by organizations which would profit financially by continued and increased importation of a foreign dump product. By an odd coincidence, many of these advocates of "free and open competition" for the fuel industry enjoy substantial tariff protection for their own industries. They are, in fact, among the Nation's fiercest enemies of foreign competition when their own prosperity is threatened by excessive importation of competing products. In other words, they want the coal industry to compete under conditions which they reject for themselves.

Any group in America has the right to exploit its partisan interests in an open letter to the President of the United States. Unfortunately, the letter on residual oil went far beyond the permissible limits of bias and partisanship. The fact is that every major contention advanced in this flamboyant advertisement was based on erroneous data. As already shown, the advocates of unrestricted importation of foreign residual

oil are not believers in "free and open competition" as they claim. Their assertion that oil controls have impaired our international relations, particularly with our good friends of Latin America, is just so much propaganda without a particle of evidence to sustain it. Their major contention, in the economic field, that controls have artificially increased the price of residual fuel oil is 100 percent inaccurate. On the contrary, the cost per barrel has decreased nearly one-third since quotas were established in 1959.

However, putting aside the minute and the exaggeration of enthusiastic partisans, I respectfully call attention to a few basic observations about an economic struggle which, thus far, has had a shattering impact upon the coal producing industry on the eastern part of the United States. In the interest of fair play, I ask the Members of the House, and the American people to bear these facts in mind:

First. The coal industry is obliged to compete against foreign residual oil for the expanding east coast public utilities and manufacturing fuel market under conditions which violate every principle of fair play and fair competition.

Second. Even the Nation's strongest, largest, and most efficient industries would be seriously hurt if they were compelled to compete in their primary market under similar conditions to those imposed on the coal industry.

Third. Foreign residual oil is being dumped on the domestic market under marketing practices which the American Government and American industry have long since rejected as unfair in the foreign marketing of our own surplus products.

In considering this question of residual oil, the first key word is "foreign" and the second key word is "waste." Upon completion of the refining process, domestic oil companies have some residual oil left. They could, if they wished, outproduce foreign refiners in this field. But the existence of residual oil is proof positive that there has been waste and inefficiency in the cracking process and for that reason domestic oil companies are trying to refine away all residual oil. This is in keeping with their stated purpose to make the American oil industry the most efficient on the face of the globe.

Yet, while domestic producers are doing their utmost to refine away residual oil, foreign producers are actually being encouraged to increase their output of this uneconomic product and I am distressed to have to observe that some interests in our own country would like to make the U.S. Government an accomplice in the process. Quite obviously, there is no point in railing against the inefficiency of the oil companies of Venezuela and the Netherlands East Indies when the greatest fuel market in the world has been opened for their competition at whatever price the traffic will bear.

Consider, for a moment, the devastating affects of what has happened in the past few years. Voluntary controls on imports were tried in 1957, and aban-

doned in 1959 in favor of mandatory controls. Since then, the quotas have been increased several times. As a result, the current price of foreign residual oil is now nearly one dollar a barrel less than it was in 1957, or a price decline of nearly one-third. Not even the most rabid proponent of unlimited importations would contend that this price drop was caused by augmented efficiency in production. The foreign producers simply decreed an unprecedented cut in prices to obstruct competition. Because residual oil is a waste product, they can charge about any price and make a profit.

The coal-mining industry in the United States has been extremely hard hit by a number of unfavorable economic factors over the past few decades. Yet, due to the sensible and sincere cooperation of mineworkers and mineowners, the industry has done a magnificent job of pulling itself up by its own bootstraps. Over the past few years, the price of coal at the mine has declined more than 60 cents a ton, a decline due entirely to increased efficiency in production. But no industry in the United States could compete against a foreign competitor able to slash prices by one-third over the same period of time. No industry in the United States should be compelled to give this outrageously unfair advantage to a foreign competitor.

The Secretary of the Interior must soon decide whether present quotas on the importation of foreign residual oil shall be extended for another year at existing levels, substantially reduced, or removed entirely as advocated by those who have a financial interest in their removal. The adoption of the latter course would not only bring chaos to the east coast fuel market—it would deal another catastrophic blow to the coal-mining industry.

Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, recently estimated that already 55,000 miners in the Appalachian region have lost their jobs through competition from foreign residual oil—lost their jobs because of the large-scale importation of a foreign waste product which our own domestic oil industry believes is so uneconomical it should be eliminated entirely. If quotas are again increased, thousands of additional miners will be thrown out of employment—and coal-hauling railroads will be equally adversely affected.

The coal-mining industry is not asking for favoritism or preferential treatment. It is asking simply for fairplay. It is demanding—and justly so—relief from a form of foreign competition, based on arbitrary pricing, which would play havoc with the Nation's soundest industries. The coal-mining industry should have equality of treatment with other industries.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that the Secretary of the Interior should establish reasonable and fair quota limitations upon the importation of foreign residual fuel oil. Following the March 10 hearings before the Secretary of the Interior, I believe that the evidence will clearly show that our own Government

should correct this injustice which is now imposed upon one of America's most basic industries.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of publicity and comment surrounding the introduction of a series of House resolutions including House Resolution 205 which shows myself as author. It appears from the furor that has ensued that certain parties, including but not limited to the press, have seen this action as an intracommittee feud in the Banking and Currency Committee. I do not view it as such.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the past and do now hold a strong and firm conviction that the field of housing is a very important sector of the American economy and of American life. This field, therefore, is entitled to a substantial and respectful attention in this House.

I would be surprised if any Member of the body would disagree with the observation that under the able leadership of Albert Rains the Subcommittee on Housing has served the national interest in housing admirably and well. To accomplish this service has required a substantial assured budget and a highly competent staff. The House of Representatives and housing in the United States lost a stalwart champion and an articulate and informed leader when Congressman Rains retired. It was my pleasure and privilege to discuss the future of the subcommittee with Chairman Rains before he left this House. It was his expressed hope and expectation that the subcommittee would continue to merit the financial support of this great body and that the activities of the subcommittee would be continued without diminution or erosion. There resides in the subcommittee a rich legacy of staff and a strong membership of able and experienced legislators. The field of housing will require legislative study, concern, and action this session. The subcommittee, as now constituted, is capable of providing all that is required if properly supported with funding and staff.

There is little to be gained in arguing about the form this support takes so long as the substance is assured and delivered. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have told my constituents in one of the fastest building sections in the Nation that I do not intend to be idle in the face of any demonstrated threat to the committee's ability to respond to the needs for housing legislation. I would be shocked and disturbed if any Member, chairman or otherwise, would act in any way to substantially impair this body's ability to

so respond. The form taken to express the support, encouragement, and assistance called for concerns me very little. The substance of such an expression concerns me a great deal.

In discussing this matter with my colleagues on the committee this was the position I had hoped to convey. This position did not require, at this time, the introduction of a resolution. In the discussions it now appears that I had, in fact, given tacit consent to have such a resolution introduced. I readily take upon myself such criticism as may be justified for having so represented myself. I want this body to be clear that in requesting, as I will request, that House Resolution 205 be tabled, I do not thereby extend to any other person any blame or criticism. So far as I can judge all parties concerned have acted honorably in pursuing their best judgment in the matter herein discussed. I trust that all will accord my present move the same kind assessment. My own failure was in misunderstanding the intelligence made available to me and in poorly articulating the intelligence I was communicating to others. My belief is that the matter is somewhat distorted and expanded beyond the place justified and that the tempest will soon be tracked to the teapot.

#### ADDRESS OF MAJORITY LEADER CARL ALBERT AT B'NAI ZION DINNER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech made by the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, in New York City.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the 57th annual dinner of B'nai Zion was held at the New York Hilton Hotel on Sunday, February 14, 1965.

B'nai Zion is the oldest American Zionist fraternal organization in this country. It is devoted to Americanism, Zionism, and fraternalism.

Once again it was my distinct honor to act as chairman of the dinner. In that capacity it was my pleasure to read to the audience a noteworthy message from our President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

The toastmaster was the honorary chairman of the Jewish National Fund, Dr. Harris J. Levine. The invocation was delivered by Rabbi William Berkowitz, the spiritual leader of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun.

There were brief greetings from the national president of the organization, Edward Sharf, and the Israeli Minister to the United States, the Honorable Mordechai Gazit. The dean of the House of Representatives, our good friend and colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, in a beautiful introduction presented to the assemblage our very able and distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT.

In his inimitable and able manner, Congressman ALBERT delivered a most timely address, worthy of the attention

of all. I am pleased to set it forth as follows:

#### ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN ALBERT

It is a special pleasure to be here with you tonight. This distinguished and large assembly by its very presence demonstrates in sentimental and practical terms its wholehearted support for the objectives of this dinner honoring the memory of our late beloved and martyred President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I am proud to have a part in this undertaking which embraces two great projects: The planting of the John F. Kennedy Peace Forest, symbolizing the bonds of friendship between the United States and Israel, and the Kennedy Evaluation and Diagnostic Center for Retarded Children near Jerusalem. This center also recognizes the enormous contributions of the entire Kennedy family to the rehabilitation of retarded children.

The late President Kennedy's abiding friendship for the Jewish people and for the cause of an independent and secure State of Israel is a matter of historic record.

It is a signal honor for me to be able to address the leaders and members of the very same organization which President—then Senator—Kennedy addressed on your silver anniversary in February 1958.

In that address he gave voice to the aspirations of free people everywhere for peace in the Middle East. In that address he dispelled a prevalent myth about that troubled area. I quote from his speech:

"This myth—with which you are all too familiar—is the assertion that it is Zionism which has been the unsettling and fevered infection in the Middle East, the belief that without Israel there would somehow be a natural harmony throughout the Middle East and the Arab world. Quite apart from the values and hopes which the State of Israel enshrines—and the past injuries which it redeems—it twists reality to suggest that it is the democratic tendency of Israel which has injected discord and dissension into the Near East. Even by the coldest calculations, the removal of Israel would not alter the basic crisis in the area. For, if there is any lesson which the melancholy events of the last 2 years and more have taught us, it is that, though Arab states are generally united in opposition to Israel, their political unities do not rise above this negative position. The basic rivalries within the Arab world, the quarrels over boundaries, the tensions involved in lifting their economies from stagnation, the cross pressures of nationalism—all of these factors would still be there, even if there were no Israel."

In 1959 Mrs. Albert and I visited all parts of the State of Israel. We saw the exciting and dynamic transformations taking place daily in that land—the expansion of agricultural and industrial technology—the rapid growth of science and culture, all moving at a pace unequalled anywhere in the world in any period of the world's history. Here literally the deserts were beginning to bloom. More than that, wherever we went in Israel we could feel the very pulse beat of a determined people—a people who will never surrender and never die.

We came away from Israel convinced that at no time since the American revolution has such a dynamic and resolute spirit been manifested among a people. No people anywhere any time ever had a more righteous claim to their land, their liberty, and their independence. It is a claim which all decent nations must not only recognize but insure. Israel is a great beachhead of democracy in an area where democracy has seldom thrived. Here indeed is an oasis of democracy in what, in too many places, is a desert of lingering feudalism.

Israel is a democracy. It is right and logical that we as a democratic Nation were the first to recognize a government with which we share many experiences, many ideals, and



many aims. Israel is both an ancient and a contemporary nation sharing many of the characteristics of our relatively youthful country. For instance, our two countries have in common the epic of mass immigration. Like America, Israel has absorbed hundreds of thousands of newcomers. Like America, Israel is a blend of many immigrant traditions, tongues, and experiences which furnish the nucleus of a culture both unified and distinctive. Like America, Israel has created unity out of diversity. Like the American pioneer, her people have toiled and sacrificed to transform the wilderness into productive land.

But there is another reason why Israel's story has won the admiration and support of Americans. The Israelis, like the first Americans, have lived under great hardship. Our forefathers had to struggle against hostile circumstances, human and physical. The Israelis, too, are denied the blessings of peace. They must work and live on the alert, constantly on the defensive; they never can be sure what lies across from them in space, ahead of them in time.

We in Washington are conscious of Israel's continuing jeopardy. We are constantly searching for effective action which will ultimately bring the Arabs and Israelis together in peace.

President Kennedy had great plans to undertake initiatives to bring peace to this area of the world. He spoke of this frequently during his presidential campaign in 1960. After taking office as President, he studied the problems, discussed the remedies, and formulated plans. It is a sad page of history that he was to meet disappointment on his way.

His fears for the security of Israel were in fact heightened in the face of the introduction into Egypt of new weapons from the Communist bloc, including heavy bombers which offered a threat to Israel's defenses.

And so in 1962, Mr. Kennedy made an important decision. He ordered a survey of the defense situation in the Middle East. After careful study, he concluded that the Egyptian bombers were fast and powerful enough to penetrate Israel's defenses and that it was necessary to provide Israel with an answer. That conclusion led to the decision to permit Israel to purchase the Hawk, the defensive ground-to-air missile which is the only real answer to the supersonic bomber.

President Kennedy was by nature a builder—a man of positive and creative instincts and philosophy. He was also a realist. While he recognized the futility of an arms race, and its vast subtractions from the sources which might have been plowed into development of the new nation, he realized too, that the failing hope of a peaceful solution made it imperative to take steps to make Israel itself strong enough to deter attack, and to make it clear that the great powers would act to avert any outbreak of hostilities. On May 8, 1963, President Kennedy told the press that the United States was opposed to the use of force, or the threat of force in the Near East, and that this Nation would take action through the United Nations or on its own to halt aggression.

That commitment on the part of the United States is essential to the preservation of the peace in the Near East. In the final analysis that peace is dependent upon a strong United States and the maintenance in our favor of the balance of power between the East and the West.

This policy of the Kennedy administration was supported by our then Vice President Lyndon Baines Johnson and has been reaffirmed since he took office as President.

Many of you here tonight will recall that President Johnson referred to this policy when he appeared before you at a function similar to this some 3 years ago. At that time he said, "The works of peace are global works. This administration will work for

peace in the Middle East as it works for progress in Africa, for social justice in Latin America, for freedom, accord, mutual trust—these are the vistas beyond the cold war which give meaning to our present struggle and which sustain the sacrifices we must be prepared to make."

President Johnson many times and on many occasions has elaborated upon and reiterated that theme.

When Prime Minister Levi Eshkol visited the White House in 1964 the President restated U.S. support of the territorial integrity and political independence of all countries in the Near East. The President is fully aware of Israel's difficulties in maintaining the integrity of her geographic boundaries and her political freedom. He is completely committed to the cause of peace and freedom in Israel and the Near East.

The President has recently received a strong assist in his mission toward peace and freedom for Israel from the Congress. A recent and impressive example of that support was demonstrated only a few days ago when most of the members of the New York congressional delegation, under the leadership of the beloved dean of the House, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, joined in rebuking the Arab Republic but, at the same time, confirmed the President's constitutional responsibility to direct foreign policy. This vote of confidence in President Johnson, I assure you, was not misplaced. The President and the leadership of the House appreciated their support.

In my judgment the commitments of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to support the territorial integrity and political independence of the countries of the Near East also have the support of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. This policy also has the support of the U.S. Congress. This is no place for partisan zeal, but as a Democrat and as a matter of making the record complete and clear, I can assure you it has the support of the Democratic Party. Last August I had the privilege of presiding over the hearings of the committee on resolutions and platform at the Democratic convention in Atlantic City.

An important pledge in the party platform, and one which received broad support during our hearings, committed our party to continue the fight for the territorial integrity of every nation and the prevention of a military imbalance. This administration, beyond any question, is dedicated to the implementation of this platform promise to the State of Israel.

The people of this country support the President's policy. The public consensus on Israel in this country is highly favorable. The public sympathizes with Israel. The bonds created by our mutual experiences in forming a free and democratic government, in overcoming obstacles, cause a flow of friendship between our two nations.

Before closing, I must mention two additional important developments in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations—one was to let the nations of the Near East know that we favor constructive and legitimate water development programs. The other was the plan to help Israel desalt water through the use of nuclear energy. It was, indeed, in this very city less than a year ago that President Johnson announced the cooperative effort between our country and the State of Israel to desalinate water, a project which is now well on the way to fruition.

In retrospect it is clear that we have passed through a most significant period in United States-Israel relations during the last 4 years. Our two democracies have come closer together. We have achieved a better understanding. We have joined in a mutual and strong resolve to work for peace in the Near East.

You in B'Nai Zion, who have worked for the establishment of Israel, may take great

satisfaction and pride in the attainment of your historic objective. But I know, and you know, that the task is not yet finished. Israel has not yet won the peace. It is the responsibility of every friend of Israel to help make sure that no aggression is committed in the area from any source.

We look forward to the time when Israel and her neighbors will live in peace. It will be an hour for rejoicing for the people of Israel, and for her many friends throughout the world. It will be a great day for democracy everywhere, for an Israel at peace will be able to make an expanding contribution to the progress and development of the free world.

An Israel at peace will contribute toward the preservation of democratic institutions everywhere and to the emergence of a vast, new, and great society among all men.

#### AMA'S REVERSAL

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who support the social security approach to hospital care for the elderly often have a difficult time of keeping up with the inconsistent strategy of this program's critics. In the following editorial the Newark Evening News, of February 9, 1965, has done an effective job of pinning down the American Medical Association's latest approach for what it is—"an extraordinary reversal of policy." I recommend this well written editorial to my colleagues in the House:

#### AMA'S REVERSAL

Leaders of the American Medical Association have pledged its financial resources in an effort to defeat the Johnson administration's hospital insurance program with the AMA's own "eldercare" plan.

Every effort in the last dozen years to put medical care for the elderly under social security has been blocked by the AMA on its premise that such a program opened the door to socialized medicine. Yet "eldercare" which the association offers in place of the administration's program is more socialistic than anything proposed by any administrative program.

Under "eldercare" the Kerr-Mills State-administered plans would be expanded by subsidizing private health insurance programs with general Federal and State tax funds. The AMA plan would provide services of physicians and surgeons and drugs, in addition to the hospitalization, nursing home care, and diagnostic services proposed in the administration's King-Anderson bill.

But whereas "eldercare" would be financed by State and Federal funds, at a cost not even estimated by the AMA, the administration's program would be supported through an additional social security tax. In short, the AMA plan not only opens the door, but welcomes its own brand of socialized medicine. In view of the AMA's former position, "eldercare" represents an extraordinary reversal of policy.

#### APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

**Mr. STALBAUM.** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that yesterday President Johnson announced his intention to reappoint Mr. John A. Gronouski as Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. Gronouski has been an excellent Postmaster General. His success in that job is no surprise to his fellow Wisconsin residents, particularly to those of us who worked with him in State government.

I had the pleasure of working closely with Mr. Gronouski when he was tax commissioner of the State of Wisconsin and when I was State senator. We worked through many crucial periods. And we worked John Gronouski hard.

I found that John Gronouski was an unusual man—Ph. D. with a practical bent. Here was a man you could look in the eye and ask for an honest answer—and get it. As a legislator I could rely on Mr. Gronouski, the administrator. And we in the legislative branch are deeply reliant on efficient administrators.

The problems of our democracy are manifold. And some of the greatest problems—those of everyday education and welfare—lie at the feet of State governments. In Wisconsin in a 2-year period we increased our school enrollments by thousands. We built the equivalent of a new university each year. To meet these obligations required money. The job of raising that money falls in the lap of the State legislature. We relied on John Gronouski for guidance in doing our job. Never once did he fail us. He sat in the hot seat as State tax commissioner and never squirmed. And my job as legislator was made that much easier.

In Mr. Gronouski's 16 months as Postmaster General, he has looked the Department's problems straight in the eye and offered solutions. The Department today has a new atmosphere. There is a climate of cooperation between the administration and labor and between the administration and business. Let me quote to you from the February 8 issue of *Advertising Age*: "The present Post Office management has displayed flexibility that has generally been missing in the past."

Mr. Gronouski moved ahead with new programs designed to accommodate a public that is mailing 2 billion more pieces of mail each year. Public acceptance of the ZIP code program has been far ahead of anticipation, as the public has learned that ZIP will get things done. Indeed, some 49,000 firms of mail users are in the process of converting their mailing list files to ZIP code. Soon to be introduced is the optical scanner, the Department will make another breakthrough in its long series of mechanization improvements that are being introduced to handle the mail explosion.

Parcel post has been revitalized. Mr. Gronouski has realized that many mailers have turned to private carriers for their parcel post.

And the programs continue. Now he has advocated the elimination of the Postal Savings System which has out-

grown its usefulness and is no longer a bargain with its 2-percent interest rate. Further, he has called for a new concept of mail transportation, using the fastest means possible. This could result in the elimination of airmail as a class.

The aim is overnight delivery of all first-class mail in any part of the country.

These are the very proud accomplishments and realistic aims of an able administrator.

So it is with confidence that I now, as Congressman, look forward to working with Postmaster General John Gronouski for 4 years. We in Wisconsin are proud of Mr. Gronouski. We in Congress are fortunate that we have an able administrator running our largest agency.

#### REAPPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL GRONOUSKI

**Mr. ROSENTHAL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. ZABLOCKI.** Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] in his commendation of President Johnson for the reappointment of the Hon. John A. Gronouski, Jr. as Postmaster General of the United States.

During the months which he has served as Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski has distinguished himself by his devotion to duty, his willingness to tackle difficult problems head on and his efforts to make the Post Office Department as efficient as possible.

A newspaper reporter once characterized Mr. Gronouski as being something like the pipe he usually has clenched in his teeth: "casual, but with a fire that causes smoke."

The description is an apt one, as anyone who has followed the career of Mr. Gronouski in Washington is aware. His manner is informal and easygoing, but he has a flintlike intellect that strikes fire when confronted by facts and statistics.

Although the smoke of controversy has sometimes hung over his words and deeds, the Postmaster General has won general respect for his grasp of his job and his accomplishments in modernizing the postal service.

We in Wisconsin are proud of our native son, John Gronouski, and are very pleased that President Johnson has reappointed him for a full Presidential term. We know he will continue to reflect credit upon himself, his family, the State of Wisconsin.

At this point I wish to read an article on Postmaster General Gronouski which appeared in this morning's *New York Times*:

OUTSPOKEN POSTAL CHIEF: JOHN AUSTIN GRONOUSKI, JR.

The Postmaster General of the United States is a bulky, pipe-smoking extrovert who

has disproved the adage that if a man speaks his mind frankly he won't get very far in life or in politics. John Austin Gronouski, Jr., who was 45 years old last October 26, has been an outspoken partisan Democrat all his adult life. Part of his reward was his Cabinet appointment 2 years ago by President Kennedy, an appointment that was renewed yesterday by President Johnson.

When the former college professor got word of his selection in 1963 he did not hesitate to acknowledge that he did not know his ZIP code and sometimes forgot to mail letters for his wife.

He said that the closest he had come to Post Office Department operations was licking stamps for John F. Kennedy's campaign in the bitter Wisconsin primary of 1960 and later in the general election.

In Washington he is acknowledged as a capable administrator of the sprawling postal operations. He arrives at his office in the Department's limousine between 9 and 10 a.m. and unless he has a social engagement in the evening, stays until 7:30 or 8 at night.

#### A PAYCHECK ERROR

He is an informal type who is equally at home in smoke-filled academic seminars or smoke-filled political parleys. He is absent-minded about such matters as getting his hair cut and has been known to work shoeless and in shirtsleeves in his Pennsylvania Avenue office.

Mr. Gronouski, the first Polish-American to receive a Cabinet appointment, was born in Dunbar, a hamlet of 106 people in northeastern Wisconsin. He explains the "U" rather than the traditional "W" in his last name by saying that his father had once received a paycheck made out that way and decided to change his name rather than waste the time correcting the error.

He grew up in Oshkosh, where his father taught high school physics, and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1942. He flew 24 missions as an Eighth Air Force navigator in World War II and now diplomatically declines to say whether any of them were directed at Poland.

Once he bailed out over the English Channel and survived even though his parachute was on up side down. "I've been lucky all my life," he says.

He received his master's degree from the university in Madison in 1947, and, while writing his doctoral dissertation on "Valuation of Railroads for Ad Valorem Tax Purposes" taught economics and statistics for 2 years at the University of Maine and 3 years at Roosevelt University in Chicago. He received his Ph. D. degree in 1955 and taught public finances and banking at Wayne State University in Detroit until 1958.

In 1959 he won a civil service examination as research director of the Wisconsin State Tax Department and in the same year was named a tax commissioner by Gov. GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin. He held that post until his Cabinet appointment.

#### HELPED PARTY IN STATE

Although he has never run for public office, Mr. Gronouski played a leading role in the resurgence of the State's Democratic Party that began when Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER was elected in 1957 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

His advice was often sought, and frequently followed, by Mr. NELSON, Gov. John W. Reynolds, and Patrick J. Lucey, former Democratic State chairman.

In last year's campaign he spent his weekends corraling the Polish-American vote for President Johnson. His command of Polish, which he has learned through intensive courses since he went to Washington, was an acknowledged help.

Mr. Gronouski and his wife, the former Mary Louise Metz of Madison, whom he married in 1949, live in a modest, two-story white



brick house near Chevy Chase Circle, Washington. Their two daughters, Stacy, 12, and Julie Kay, 9, attend public schools.

The Gronouskis appear frequently at social events in the Capital. The Postmaster General drinks Scotch at parties; with friends he likes to put his feet up and drink beer. Except for an occasional dip in a swimming pool, the extent of his athletic exertions has been checkers.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 16th of February 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania: on this date in 1918, the Lithuanian people regained their status as an independent and free member of the world's community of nations after centuries of occupation and oppression.

Although it was an important bulwark of Christianity against the invasions from the east during the Middle Ages, as well as a buffer protecting the eastern Slavic people from German invasions from the west, its independence was short lived. Its more powerful neighbors, the Russians, the Germans, and the Poles all wished to have control over the strategically located little state. It was, as a result, incorporated into the Polish monarchy in the 14th century. This union lasted for over 400 years. Then, in the third partition of Poland in 1795, Lithuania was incorporated into Russia, and came under the domination of the czars.

Subjected to a policy designed to eradicate their national existence, the Lithuanians expressed their opposition by staging a number of uprisings and rebellions. Determined to retain their separate identity, culture, and religion, they worked and waited for the opportunity to once again declare themselves free men. And, in the aftermath of World War I, when both Russian and German troops had left, the Lithuanian Council announced the independence of the Lithuanian Republic.

For some two decades thereafter, the Lithuanians were able to govern themselves. They established a democratic state, with a professed adherence to the ideals for which we ourselves continue to strive. It was, however, not their fortune to be able to retain the benefits of freedom and independence. Once again, its more powerful and rapacious neighbors began to interfere in its affairs. They made claims upon the territory, and finally, during World War II, subjected it to the vicissitudes of armed occupation, this time by Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

The last 25 years have seen Lithuania incorporated once again into the Russian Empire—this time as a fictitious 14th constituent republic of the Soviet Union. Consequently, on this day, we cannot really celebrate, in the traditional sense

of the word, the independence of this people. Rather, we mark the date: in recognition of the determination of a brave people for independence, and in the hope that having once succeeded against all adversity, they shall once again be victorious.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For the sons and daughters of Lithuania and for Americans, it is a day of sad remembrance, but, it is also a day, in which free people stand giving voice and strength to the aspirations of a captive nation.

Some 3 million Lithuanians now live in their historic homeland on the eastern shore of the Baltic Sea. These people have known mankind's cruelest torture. They have suffered the agonies of hunger and poverty, the savagery of war, and the brutality of oppression. In their long fight for freedom and justice, the hearts of the Lithuanian people have touched the deepest of sorrow.

Beginning in the 18th century Lithuania, which had developed a distinctive and progressive culture, first fell prey to Russian invasion. For 120 years its people lived under the domination of Russia, and yet never once during this period did the spirit of freedom falter. At the cost of blood and the intensification of military control, the Lithuanian people revolted five times against the ruthless despotism of the Russian czars. It was in retaliation for one of these latter revolts that Lithuanian prayer books were forbidden amongst a religious people for 40 years.

By the time of World War I, the nation of Lithuania, inflamed with national aspirations met with enthusiasm the proclamation by President Woodrow Wilson of the principle of self-determination. On February 16, 1918, while under German occupation, the Lithuanian people in Vilnius courageously proclaimed their independence and right to a free life.

Today, once again, Lithuania is darkened under the shadow of foreign military might. The people of Lithuania whose heritage has maintained the cause of freedom and liberty for centuries are the enslaved victims of Soviet postwar aggression. On this anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania, let us therefore reaffirm our responsibility to a gallant people, and let us ring the message of hope to all who are held in bondage.

In this 89th Congress I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 138 requesting that the President of the United States initiate action in the United Nations calling for first, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; second, the return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave camps in the Soviet Union; and third,

the supervision by the United Nations of free elections in the Baltic States. May passage of this resolution be the first step in ridding the Baltic States from the yoke of communism. House Concurrent Resolution 138 follows:

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a national unity and freedom of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this national unification of the free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, the Baltic nations, having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries, are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for national independence and freedom; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas no just peace and security can be achieved in the world while these and other nations remain enslaved: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets—*

(a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(b) to return all Baltic deportees from Siberia, prisons and slave camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

*Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.*

#### REMOVAL OF EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to remove the 10-percent excise tax from passenger automobiles retroactive to this date regardless of when this bill passes. Some people have already said to me, "The automobile companies are making money. Why remove that tax and help them?" The removal of this tax will result in a reduced price of the automobiles to the consumer: first, the automobile manufacturers have assured the Ways and Means Committee that they would pass the tax reduction to the consumer; sec-

ond, the Federal Government requires the manufacturers to publish the price of automobiles. The purchaser of a new automobile, therefore, can check to determine whether or not he has received the reduction. This is not true of any other item sold. Only automobile manufacturers are required to publish their prices. On any other item from which the excise tax is removed, it is true that the consumer cannot police the removal and will not actually know whether he received the reduction or whether the seller merely increased his margin of profit. There is less danger, therefore, of the consumer failing to benefit from an automobile excise tax reduction than from any other excise tax reduction.

The excise tax cut on automobiles will inure to the benefit of those families making less than \$7,500 per year, who purchase two-thirds of all automobiles.

Some have suggested that the purchaser of a new automobile who trades in a car will not realize the full tax reduction because the amount he receives for the trade-in will be lowered by the amount of the excise tax that he would have paid on the new car. This, of course, is a used-car dealer's argument, made to protect existing stock. Carried to its logical conclusion it would mean that a manufacturer could never give a meaningful reduction to the purchasers of automobiles. In fact, the purchaser of an automobile who trades in a car may not realize in the first trade-in the full \$225 average excise tax reduction, but he will realize a very meaningful percentage of it. The purchaser of a new car without a trade-in will get the full reduction. The purchaser of a used car, because used cars are competitive with new cars, will get a meaningful reduction. The estimated growth in the gross national product from the automobile excise tax removal will be approximately \$5 billion the first year. The spur to the economy will be meaningful.

An automobile excise tax removal, because it will be passed on to a consumer and will stimulate the economy, will not, however, be inflationary. A total removal of all excise taxes, including those on passenger cars passed on to the consumer will push down the cost-of-living index.

More than any other item, automobiles, their use, their price, their design, affects the American economy and American life. Approximately one person in every six gainfully employed today is employed because of American automobiles—either directly or indirectly. The removal of this tax, therefore, on cars, would be a vast benefit to the entire economy.

There are some who feel that the excise tax should merely be transferred to the highway trust fund for the building of highways. This argument fails to consider that historically an earmarked tax is practically never repealed. In the case of automobiles, therefore, it would mean that approximately \$225 per car would be built into the price. There is a second argument, however, the tax on passenger automobiles could never conceivably be considered a user's tax. First, it is not levied on a per-mile basis;

but, secondly, and much more importantly, the use of an automobile inures economically at least as much to the benefit of the sellers of all other items as it does to the benefit of the manufacturers of automobiles. Consider your neighborhood shopping center that parks 10,000 cars and then tell me who benefits most, or in what degree, from the use of cars.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the economy, I urge the speedy enactment of the excise tax cut and I particularly urge that the tax on passenger automobiles be terminated, retroactive to this date.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, I believe it is fitting and proper to introduce the House concurrent resolution which I first offered on July 16, 1963. Its adoption would have Congress call on the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation.

Conscious of the fact that the sense and contents of this resolution constitute the first step in the supremely humanitarian task of liberating the Lithuanians and the other Baltic peoples from Communist totalitarian tyranny, I strongly urge its implementation.

Some 3 million gallant Lithuanians have always fought courageously for the preservation of personal and national freedom in their homeland of northeastern Europe.

Centuries ago there on the eastern shore of the Baltic they founded their own kingdom and lived in peace with their neighbors, the Estonians and the Latvians. At one time their kingdom was strong and became a real force in all Eastern Europe. Late in the 14th century the Lithuanian kingdom was united with the kingdom of Poland by the marriage of the sovereigns of the two kingdoms, and this union continued until the final partition of Poland in 1795. By that partition most of Poland, and with it Lithuania became part of the Russian Empire. Thenceforth Lithuania was a Russian province for more than 120 years, until the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917. That gave the Lithuanians the golden opportunity to free themselves. This they did on February 16, 1918, by proclaiming their independence and by establishing the Lithuanian Republic.

The birth of that Republic 47 years ago ushered in a new era in Lithuanian modern history, and a happy period in their national life. But the Lithuanians were to enjoy their freedom for only a brief period of the interwar years. Even so, in that relatively short time, they rebuilt

war-ravaged country instituted their own democratic form of government, and re-established many of the Lithuanian national institutions. But the gathering of the storm in 1939 cast a dark shadow over their liberated country, and that proved fatal to their freedom. First the Kremlin imposed upon the Lithuanian Government a so-called mutual assistance pact. Then in June of 1940 the country was occupied by the Red Army, and in July it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus ended the short span freedom and independence in Lithuania.

Even though Lithuanian liberty, in this century lasted for only 22 years, it was long enough that Lithuanians today are willing to die for the restoration of freedom to their homeland in the rest of this century and beyond.

I appeal to my fellow Americans to understand and undertake the cause which is heard in the heartbeat of every Lithuanian. The Lithuanians have none of the freedoms which we consider the birthright of all peoples. Under such oppressed conditions they do not have the freedom to observe their national holiday, the Lithuanian Independence Day. But all freedom-loving Lithuanians in the free world, and especially Americans of Lithuanian descent, observe the anniversary of that event with due solemnity and hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian struggle is America's struggle for just as Russia robbed Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, of their national independence, international communism now threatens this Nation with the same fate.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to announce to my colleagues in the House that these sentiments express the feelings of thousands of my constituents in Rochester, N.Y. Just last weekend, I was privileged to address a Lithuanian Independence Day observance conducted in Rochester by the local chapter of the Lithuanian American Council. My good friend and an arch champion of freedom for the enslaved peoples of the world, Peter Norkelunas, had invited me to this impressive gathering of patriots.

I told my constituents assembled for this rededication to the principles of liberty and their restoration to Lithuania and the other Eastern European nations where the boot of communism has blotted them out that the United States must be the leader of the free world family of nations in securing human rights wherever they are denied. We in America owe our moral encouragement to the anti-Communist commitment of these brave people. They deserve our wholehearted support as they fight to free themselves from Soviet tyranny.

#### HORTON CRITICAL OF WEST GERMAN SURRENDER TO NASSER

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.



Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I share the sense of disbelief and disappointment expressed by many of my colleagues concerning the action of the West German Government suspending further shipment of military materials to Israel.

The forces of freedom have been losing a great deal of ground in this sensitive world area of late, and I am not at all pleased by prospects for the future.

I think the United States must take a positive stance in protest against Bonn's capitulation to Nasser's blackmail threat. It hardly seems the shaky status already apparent in relations between West Germany and the United Arab Republic could be changed for the worse were Nasser to afford recognition of the Communist regime in East Germany. Consequently, even if Nasser carries out his threat, our investment of interest is harmed more by the loss to Israel of the arms she needs to maintain a defensive deterrent.

After the sorry spectacle, the Israeli people might well ask themselves with regard to the Bonn blunder, "With friends like that, who needs enemies?" At least, Nasser's intent is clear. He is out to destroy the democracy that flowers in Israel. But, Bonn's intentions have been masked, and not until Nasser became noisy did this absence of an honest commitment to helping Israel fight this destructive design.

It is not too late for West Germany to redeem itself. In fact, the Bonn government could go even a step further than we in the United States have been willing to take. West Germany can and should halt aid to Nasser, not Israel. It should act in accord with the original action of this House in cutting off further surplus food shipments to Nasser—an action which was changed over my vote of opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is looked to for leadership. We can manifest it in this case by showing our concern for the nation of Israel, freedom's finest friend in the Near East, in appealing to the West German Government to reconsider and rescind its dangerous decision.

#### A BILL PROVIDING JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS OF HEW

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, despite the provision for judicial review in at least 12 other Federal programs, including the 1965 version of the King-Anderson bill, there is no provision in the Social Security Act permitting States to have administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare reviewed by the courts to determine their reasonableness or conformity with the intent of Congress. The need for such

a procedure has been called to my attention by the Federal-State Relations Committee of the Governors Conference, the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, the National Association of Counties, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I am introducing legislation today which, by correcting this omission, will help to promote cooperative federalism in the field of social security grant programs.

All of the bipartisan associations mentioned above are on record in favor of legislation of this kind, and I am sure that after Congress studies the matter, it will concur in the recommendation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that the Congress amend the Social Security Act to give the States the right of appeal to the U.S. court of appeals—for the circuit in which the State is located—from the administrative decisions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the conformity of State plans under the public assistance titles of the act.

My bill, which is an improved version of legislation that I originally introduced 2 years ago, does just that. I and members of my staff, working closely with the Council of State Governments and with the National Association of Counties, have carefully considered certain objections by HEW to the original bill and, hopefully, made a satisfactory adjustment of all the Department's valid contentions. There is neither a lack of precedent for judicial review nor a lack of desire for it on the part of the States; with bipartisan support this bill, which protects the rights of the States and in no way interferes with the administrative efficiency of the Department, will soon be enacted.

No one is claiming that the States have been badly treated at the hands of HEW, but there is room for improvement. The existing arrangements by which the States have no recourse beyond the decision of the Secretary puts them in a subordinate position to the Department and, moreover, tends to stifle State initiative for fear anything new may be declared out of conformity with the act and result in the impairment of ongoing programs. The experiences of New York, North Carolina, Michigan, Indiana, and other States point to the need for more formal arrangements through which aggrieved States may receive a judicial determination of their disagreements with the Department.

In brief, my bill provides time limitation within which the Secretary will make a determination as to whether a State plan or similar proposal conforms to the act. If, after reconsideration by the Secretary, the State is still dissatisfied with the decision it may appeal to the appropriate court of appeals. Any amendment of a State plan which is required by law may be treated in the same way or subjected to declaratory judgment proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act, at the option of the State. A finding by the Secretary that in the administration of a program there is a failure to comply with

the applicable laws shall be subject to judicial review. Any State which has amended its plan for participation in a program, or which is proposing such an amendment, may by declaratory judgment proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act secure a determination as to the effect of such amendment on the State's continued participation in the program. The Secretary's authority to cut off funds is not diminished but if he determines that his initial findings are incorrect he shall certify restitution to the State.

#### OUR BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the Members and particularly the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the article of Columnist Walter Lippmann relating to the balance-of-payments problem, now being called the gold problem, of the United States. Although the article plays down the adverse effect of the foreign aid program on our balance-of-payments problem, the fact still remains that since World War II over \$100 billion has gone abroad through our innumerable foreign aid programs. The recent tying of a portion of foreign aid to the purchase of American goods only softens the adverse effect of the program on our balance-of-payments problem—it does not avoid the crushing force of its blow.

Now is the time for the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to read again the report of the late President Kennedy's Clay Committee. Is it not time to pare down the foreign aid program to a billion dollars as recommended by this distinguished committee? No one can deny, as stated by General Clay, that a "lot of money has been wasted." The fat of the program, I submit, is still too heavy to carry. Our adverse balance-of-payments plight demands that we put the program on an economy diet.

I include the following article by Walter Lippmann.

#### OUR DOLLAR DEBT ABROAD (By Walter Lippmann)

The gold problem which now confronts this country is another facet of the change in our world position as the postwar era has come to an end. During the two World Wars we accumulated a very large part of the gold stocks of the world: the gold came here to pay for the munitions and the goods which the United States alone was able to supply.

When the Second World War was over, foreign countries had run out of gold and usable assets to pay for reconstruction and recovery. There was, as it was then called, a dollar gap. The U.S. financed the recovery and defense of the Western World by enacting the Marshall plan, by providing defense through NATO, and by making very considerable expenditures abroad to assist development in backward countries. The

dollars we gave and lent for those purposes filled the dollar gap.

This was a noble and enlightened policy, and it has been very successful. However, it reached a turning point about the end of 1957. The postwar dollar gap had been closed for the major industrial countries, and foreigners and foreign governments began to accumulate dollars instead of buying American goods. Less than half of these dollars were cashed in for gold which resulted in the building up of gold reserves abroad. Between 1957 and 1965 we paid out some \$8 billion in gold. But \$12 billion accumulated in that time by foreigners were not cashed for gold. These dollars were, of course, foreign debts owed by the United States. They have now reached a total of some \$28 billion.

From a banking point of view, there is nothing extraordinary about this. All banks have larger liabilities than they can cash out at once. But in the last 3 months of 1964, there was a sudden and sharp increase in the dollars going abroad as compared with our receipts from abroad. As the world's main substitute for a central banker, we are now faced with the fundamental problem of any banker, which is to keep his depositors convinced that they have nothing to gain, and perhaps something to lose, by demanding cash and starting a run on the bank.

In his skillfully balanced message, the President has told foreigners who hold dollars that we regard these dollars as debts of honor on which we shall pay gold if that is what they want. At the same time, he has told the American people at home that as this Government intends to honor its debts, it must and it will stop increasing those debts, and that it means to move resolutely toward a balance in our international payments.

The President has made a solemn guarantee to the outer world and has announced a decision, the validity of which no one here at home disputes. Are the guarantee and the promise made by the decision credible?

The guarantee to foreign holders of dollars is entirely credible because the assets of the United States in gold and property which is as good as gold far exceed our dollar liabilities. We still have very large stocks of gold. We have large drawing rights at the International Monetary Fund. We have a surplus stockpile of basic raw materials which can be sold in the world market and is probably worth at least \$5 billion. Our foreign assets abroad, the stocks, investments, the real estate we own, are said to be worth something like \$88 billion. With this material reserve, the guarantee to pay cash for our debts cannot really be questioned.

As regards the decision to balance our international payments so as not to increase the debts we owe abroad, there can be no doubt that the Government can do this if it is determined to do so. It must be remembered abroad that the American deficit does not arise because the United States cannot afford to buy the food, the raw materials, the goods and the services that our people need. We earn more than enough to pay for all of these things. We are now selling \$6 billion more goods and services than we buy abroad.

When we break down our deficit, it is seen to be due principally to the fact that American investment abroad, whether direct or through the purchase of securities, or through bank loans, has been greatly in excess (last year by some \$4 billion) of what foreigners invested in the United States. It is true that we spend many billions abroad on our Armed Forces and on foreign aid. But it is inaccurate and merely confuses the issue to suppose that the deficit is due to foreign aid or military expenditure abroad. About 85 percent of the money spent for for-

eign aid is tied to the purchase of American goods. The military outpayments, which reflect national policy, are in part at least offset by the purchase in the United States of military supplies by foreign governments.

It is therefore American private investment abroad which will have to be reduced. The President, characteristically and quite wisely, is beginning by an appeal to businessmen and bankers for voluntary cooperation. But if there are important noncooperators, he will have to turn to legal compulsion.

Toward the end of his message the President took note of the fact that his defense of the dollar will by its very success confront the rest of the world with an urgent problem. It is the problem of a monetary reform which will provide sufficient international liquidity and bank reserves. As the President says in his message, "the flow of dollars abroad into the central banks has made up about half of the increase in free world reserves," and that increase will be cut off when our payments are balanced. This will create new problems, for our dollars, circulating abroad "as good as gold," have masked the hard fact that there is not enough gold in existence to meet the monetary requirements of the major trading countries of the world. A means of payment to supplement gold and dollars must therefore be devised.

The President has now committed this country to international monetary reform.

#### YEAR 1965 BUDGET EXPANDS WELFARE STATE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that President Johnson has managed to hold administrative budget requests for fiscal 1966 below the \$100 billion mark should not obscure the fact that the budget contains more and broader proposals for expanding the welfare state than any budget since the Truman administrative budget of 1950.

The First National City Bank's economic letter of February 1965 points out that estimated budget receipts and expenditures for 1966 are underestimates since:

As financial blueprints of the "Great Society," they contain many fiscal devices to minimize reported spending, while providing many opportunities for future expansion.

For the administrative budget alone, expenditures will total \$99.7 billion and receipts \$94.4 billion. On the more comprehensive cash budget basis spending is projected at \$127.4 billion and receipts at \$123.5 billion, leaving a deficit of \$3.9 billion. Despite attempts to economize, the President is offering a budget which represents a new high in Federal spending.

As a major indicator of the expenditure trend, the amount of new spending authority requested of Congress is higher this year than ever before. As the letter says:

New obligational authority—appropriations and other congressional authorizations for Federal spending commonly referred to as

NOA in the budget comes to \$112.4 billion, including \$6 billion put in as supplementary requests for fiscal 1965. This is a sharp rise from NOA levels of recent years, which have been close to the \$100 billion mark. Moreover, the "planned deficit" of \$5.3 billion is the sixth straight year of red ink in the administrative budget.

Included in the cash budget are social security payments, which raise questions of the widest import this year. Cash benefits are expected to rise by 7 percent beginning July 1, 1965, and the administration hopes to initiate a program of hospital benefits the following year. To finance the increased benefits, social security taxes will increase sharply, expanding the taxable wage base from \$4,800 to \$5,600 per worker and increasing the combined employer-employee tax rate from the present 7½ to 8½ percent in 1966 to 10 percent in 1968 and 10.4 percent in 1971. In a large number of cases, therefore, workers with several dependents are soon going to be paying more in social security taxes than in individual income taxes.

It is paramount that expenditures be limited by eliminating low-priority programs which offer few benefits for the costs involved. In addition, we must give high priority to a study of the economic effects of the growing payroll tax, which may eventually become so large as to serve as an economic impediment to job creation and also as an incentive to more rapid introduction of labor-saving devices.

Under unanimous consent I wish to include the First National City Bank monthly economic letter for February 1965 in the Record at this point:

#### THE \$127 BILLION BUDGET

That President Johnson is again holding administrative budget requests below the \$100 billion mark captured the headlines when he submitted his fiscal 1966 budget proposals to Congress on January 25. This gesture of fiscal conservatism, however, should not distract attention from the fact that the budget contains the broadest proposals for expanding the welfare state since the fiscal 1950 budget during the Truman administration. Indeed, while most of the Truman proposals died in Congress, it is widely conceded that the bulk of President Johnson's plans will win approval.

Expenditures in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965 are estimated at \$99.7 billion and receipts at \$94.4 billion, leaving a deficit of \$5.3 billion. The under \$100 billion figure, however, is misleading since it is based on the narrow administrative budget, which considerably understates the fiscal impact of Government. On the more comprehensive "cash budget" basis—which includes social security and other Government activities outside the regular budget—spending next year is projected at \$127.4 billion and receipts at \$123.5 billion, indicating a deficit of \$3.9 billion. On this basis, expenditures will rise by \$6 billion or about 5 percent.

Both sets of figures are undoubtedly underestimates of spending in the coming year. As financial blueprints of the "Great Society," they contain many fiscal devices to minimize reported spending, while providing many opportunities for future expansion of spending programs. Indeed, while President Johnson has submitted an economy-size package bearing a minimum list price, Congress may well take advantage of the optional features to raise the spending total above the \$100 billion mark before the session is over.



## Summary of Federal finances

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1964 actual	Fiscal 1965		Fiscal 1966 estimate
		Original estimate	New estimate	
Administrative budget:				
Expenditures.....	97.7	97.9	97.5	99.7
Receipts.....	89.5	93.0	91.2	94.4
Deficit (-) or surplus (+).....	-8.2	-4.9	-6.3	-5.3
Cash budget:				
Cash payments.....	120.3	122.7	121.4	127.4
Cash receipts.....	115.5	119.7	117.4	123.5
Deficit (-) or surplus (+).....	-4.8	-2.9	-4.0	-3.9
National income budget:				
Expenditures.....	118.5	121.5	121.0	127.0
Receipts.....	114.7	118.8	116.0	121.0
Deficit (-) or surplus (+).....	-3.9	-2.8	-5.0	-6.0

## NEITHER EXTRAVAGANT NOR MISERLY

Because of the built-in flexibility, the new document is not as susceptible of easy classification as last year's economy budget, which won widespread approval because of the emphasis placed on spending restraint, combined with massive income tax cuts. The accent this year has shifted to increased spending on domestic welfare programs, together with a moderate cut in excise taxes.

In his budget message, the President described his fiscal plans as neither "extravagant" nor "miserly," but designed to promote our economic growth and national strength. Nevertheless, while many elements of his program are similar to past proposals, enactment of the major items would result in the first major expansion of Federal welfare activities since the New Deal era of the midthirties. The principal proposals are:

Provide hospital benefits under social security and a 7-percent increase in cash benefits.

Reduce excise taxes by \$1½ billion.  
Give Federal aid to education on a broad scale.

Quadruple spending for the war on poverty. Establish regional medical centers to fight major killing and crippling diseases.

Initiate a massive program to uplift the Appalachian region.

Opinions may differ on the priority for these and other programs on the Great Society agenda. But there can be no doubt that the financial cost will be substantial. Advocates of new programs in such areas as hospital care and education make no secret of the fact they will seek to expand them once they become law. When it comes to paying the bill, however, working people may be in for a rude shock. On January 1, 1966, for example, social security taxes will be raised by more than \$4 billion a year as the first step to meet costs of increased benefits.

As the President has pointed out, making a budget involves "hard decisions and difficult choices." While expenditures are being increased on the domestic welfare side, spending for defense, space, and atomic energy are either leveling out or drifting downward. At the same time, economies are being sought through revision of programs, as in the case of farm price supports and merchant marine subsidies, or through user charges, as in the case of commercial airlines, trucks, and inland waterways. The President also promised to renew his efforts to cut costs and raise productivity in the Federal Establishment.

Despite these economizing efforts, the curve of Federal spending is headed sharply higher. A sensitive indicator of the expenditure trend is the amount of spending authority re-

quested of Congress. New obligational authority—appropriations and other congressional authorizations for Federal spending, commonly referred to as NOA—in the budget comes to \$112.4 billion, including \$6 billion put in as supplementary requests for fiscal 1965. This is a sharp rise from the NOA levels of the recent years, which have been close to the \$100 billion mark. Moreover, the "planned deficit" of \$5.3 billion is the sixth straight year of red ink in the administrative budget.

In weighing the current impact of Federal spending on the economy, however, economists favor the "national income" budget, which shows Federal income and outgo on an accrual basis. The "planned deficit" for fiscal 1966 by this measure is \$6 billion. But the deficit is certain to be much higher during the half year starting July 1, 1965, when both the excise tax cuts and the increase in social security payments are slated to take effect. Clearly, a great deal of fiscal stimulus is planned for the second half of the year. Moreover, press reports from Capitol Hill indicate that Congress may deepen the slash in excise taxes beyond the administration's request of \$1½ billion to as much as \$4 billion. Under the administration's plan, social security payments are expected to go up by more than a \$1 billion annual rate at midyear (with payments retroactive to January 1), but payroll taxes will go up by some \$4 billion a year on January 1, 1966, to finance enlarged benefits and the proposed hospital care plan to start on July 1, 1966.

## Federal expenditures by major function, fiscal year 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal 1966 estimated	Change from—	
		Fiscal 1965 estimated	Fiscal 1964 actual
National defense.....	\$51,578	-\$582	-\$2,603
International affairs and Finance.....	3,984	-59	+297
Total, Defense.....	55,562	-641	-2,306
Space Research and Technology.....	5,100	+200	+929
Agriculture.....	3,944	-533	-1,616
Natural resources.....	2,691	-44	-213
Commerce and transportation.....	2,804	-568	-198
Housing and community development.....	10	+290	+90
Health, labor, and welfare.....	8,328	+2,120	+2,853
Education.....	2,663	+1,154	+1,324
Veterans benefits and services.....	4,623	-760	-869
Interest.....	11,594	+308	+829
General government.....	2,462	+45	+182
Total, nondefense.....	44,219	+2,212	+3,737
Allowances:			
Appalachia.....	107	+104	+107
Contingencies.....	400	+300	+400
Less: Interfund transactions.....	600	-233	-64
Total, budget expenditures.....	99,687	+2,206	+2,003
Trust fund expenditures (including Government-sponsored enterprises).....	32,898	+3,853	+4,013
Less: Intragovernmental transactions, etc.....	5,188	+54	-1,049
Total, cash outlays.....	127,398	+6,005	+7,066

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

## LEVELING OUT IN DEFENSE AND SPACE

Of all the major spending proposals, the least controversial are likely to be in the defense area, where expenditures are being cut \$582 million to \$51.6 billion. This total, moreover, is \$2.6 billion below the 1964 figure. A powerful military posture, the perceptible relaxation in relations with Russia, and the economizing efforts of Defense Secretary McNamara are contributing to the decline in

outlays. In a period of revolutionary changes in weapons technology, President Johnson's military spending philosophy—expressed in his defense message last month—deserves wide support:

Outmoded weapons must be replaced by new ones.

Obsolete equipment and installations must be eliminated.

Costly duplication of effort must be eliminated.

New weapons provided for in the budget are an improved version of the Polaris missile, a new air-to-ground attack missile, the F-111 (formerly TFX) fighter plane and the SR-71 intercontinental reconnaissance plane unveiled last year. Development will continue on the Nike X antimissile system and work will be started on the C-5A—a giant transport airplane that may also become a commercial airliner with twice the capacity of present jetliners. On the other hand, cost savings of some \$4.8 billion a year are projected by 1966 from levels 3 years earlier.

Outlays for atomic energy are also headed lower for the second straight year, reflecting the test ban treaty and other attempts to control the buildup of nuclear arms. After a rapid climb, expenditures for the space program are slated to rise by only \$200 million to \$5.1 billion in the coming year. While proceeding with its man-on-the-moon project for 1970, the Space Administration is also seeking funds to start development of an unmanned spacecraft to explore Mars in 1971.

The actual trend of the international affairs and finance category—which encompasses our foreign aid and trade activities—is confused by the complicated bookkeeping employed. Though net spending is shown as declining slightly, this may well be more apparent than real.

## GROWTH IN EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Sharing the spotlight on the domestic side are the sharp increases projected for education, social security, and the war on poverty. New obligational authority of \$4.1 billion is being requested for education; actual spending in the coming year is estimated at \$2.7 billion, up more than 75 percent from the current year. The largest part of the increase will come in a request for grants to elementary and high school districts calculated on a formula based on numbers of pupils from poor families. It has been estimated that some 85 percent of school districts across the Nation would qualify for grants. Other programs would benefit private and parochial school students as well as public school pupils.

The biggest single increase in the whole budget comes under the omnibus heading of Health, Labor, and Welfare, with spending slated to rise by \$2.1 billion to \$8.3 billion in fiscal 1966. Including a downpayment on the proposed regional medical centers, spending for health services and research is slated to rise by \$400 million to \$2.2 billion. Labor and manpower development programs will continue their steady expansion of recent years, while public assistance payments are expected to rise by half a billion. As mentioned earlier, outlays for the war on poverty are slated to quadruple to \$1.3 billion.

Though not included in the administrative budget, the social security system will involve questions of the widest import this year. The administration is proposing to raise cash benefits by 7 percent beginning July 1, 1965, and to initiate a program of hospital benefits to begin a year later. Meanwhile, to pay for the increased benefits—on top of commitments arising from the maturing of the system—social security taxes are to be raised sharply. This would involve expanding the taxable wage base from \$4,800 to \$5,600 per worker and increasing the combined employer-employee tax rate from the present 7½ to 8½ percent in 1966, to 10 per-

cent in 1968 and to 10.4 percent in 1971. In many cases, therefore, workers with several dependents will sooner or later be paying more in social security taxes than in individual income taxes. Moreover, the proposed program would provide only hospital and nursing care costs and not the cost of physicians' fees and drugs as many people have assumed from the heated discussions of "Medicare."

#### TAXES AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

In his state of the Union message last month, the President said that the Great Society would not "flower spontaneously from swelling riches and surging power." But he also admitted that "It will not be the gift of Government or the creation of Presidents."

What should be no less clear is that the Great Society cannot be built without a strong, rapidly growing private economy. This means that further efforts must be made to reform our tax system to provide greater incentives for people to work and create—for their own benefit as well as for the common interest. Even nominally Socialist governments abroad are reforming their revenue systems to get away from excessive reliance on income and payroll taxes that discourage people from seeking or offering work.

With further restructuring of our tax system in mind, therefore, Congress should not go beyond the \$1½ billion excise reduction proposed by the administration. Meanwhile, expenditures should be limited by eliminating low-priority spending programs that offer few benefits for the costs involved. Consideration should also be given to the possible need for altering the payroll tax underpinning the social security system, which may in time come to weigh too heavily on active workers and employers in our productive organization.

The continuing goal should be further reductions in individual and corporate income tax rates, combined with simplifying reforms. The new budget document amply confirms the benefits gained from last year's \$14 billion tax cut. Releasing the tax brakes has resulted in such an economic upsurge that Federal revenues from individual and corporate income taxes are continuing to rise without interruption: from \$72.2 billion in fiscal 1964 to \$72.6 billion in 1965 and an estimated \$75.8 billion in fiscal 1966. This is a success story that needs to be repeated.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE: A VICTIM OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject following my remarks today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today as we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to a great and gallant people. Lithuanians are a people who have suffered

much, but they are also a people who have achieved much. Western civilization is the richer for Lithuania and on this occasion we express our gratitude for its rich and meaningful contributions. Certainly, the United States is a more abundant nation for having received within its massive population this truly gifted and hardworking people.

In commemorating Lithuanian independence we as Members of Congress have the opportunity to convey the feelings of our people for the oppressed people of Lithuania. But, on the other hand, we can use this opportunity to convey also to the people of the world the nature of Soviet imperialism; and it is on this subject of imperialism that I wish to say a few words.

Soviet imperialism is the challenge of the 20th century.

Soviet imperialism is a challenge for you; it is a challenge for me; it is a challenge for all people who seek nothing more in this world than to live in peace.

Ever since the day when the Communists seized power in Russia, they and their followers throughout the world have with brazen disregard for the truth charged Western democracies with "imperialism."

We of the West were the "warmongers;" we were the "imperialists;" we were the "oppressors" of mankind, the curse of humanity, the antichrist, so to speak, of the modern age.

And the Communists? They were, according to their twisted thinking, the evangelists of peace, prosperity, and democracy; they were the hope of civilization, and indeed, the wave of the future.

The Communists have never ceased to stress their claim to be the real saviors of mankind. In every corner of the earth the Soviets have hammered away at this propaganda fiction. They have spent billions of dollars for this purpose and have, furthermore, charged their militant, obscurantist followers with the duty as Communists to preach their gospel of hatred and deception.

It is a shocking spectacle, indeed, to behold that many peoples of the world have actually been taken in by their cleverly calculated untruths.

Unfortunately, these naive people, for naive is what they are—these people have not heard the truth of Soviet imperialism. They have not heard that the Communist gospel is not one of mankind's redemption, but of mankind's enslavement. Theirs is a gospel that is death for humanity. It brings no hope to the miserable; it lights no way to happiness and prosperity; it opens up no doors to a new life for mankind; its record is one of failure in human effort and depression of the human spirit; for in the accoutrements of every Communist are the chains of tyranny and suppression.

But how many peoples in Asia and Africa who have fallen victims to Soviet propaganda know this?

How many of them have heard of the fate of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States?

How many have heard of the reign of terror that the Soviets have visited upon Eastern Europe?

How many of them know the truth of the Soviet Union's inhumanity toward man?

The truth of Soviet imperialism must reach those peoples. They must know the true story of Lithuania. They must know the unhappy events that befell that once free and prosperous nation. They must know that it was the Soviet Union which willfully and wantonly destroyed the independence of this free national republic.

During the interwar period when Lithuania was a free and independent nation, the Soviet Union and the Lithuanian Government were bound by a series of treaties which recognized one fundamental and vital principle in the conduct of international affairs, and that principle was this: The Soviet Union pledged that it would respect the territorial integrity and the national independence of Lithuania.

In the peace treaty between both nations, in the nonaggression pact, and in numerous other instruments negotiated between the Lithuanian and Soviet Governments, this principle was given a prominent place. And yet, despite these repeated pledges of fidelity, despite Soviet reassurances in the Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939—a treaty which was imposed upon Lithuania in violation of other treaties and required the stationing of Soviet troops on Lithuanian soil—despite all these assurances, the Soviet Union broke this pledge when in June 1940 Soviet armed forces invaded Lithuania.

The history of Lithuania that followed is a familiar story to all Americans: incorporation into the U.S.S.R. as a republic; mass deportations; total terror; and attempted destruction of the nation as a whole by forced sovietization. This is the same general pattern of Communist oppression we have seen duplicated in one way or another throughout Eastern Europe, in China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and in Cuba.

Such has been the "enlightened" rule of the Soviet oppressors.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence all the free world should take a moment and consider the fate of this unfortunate country.

Here is a clear case of Communist aggression.

Here is a clear case of national oppression on a vast scale.

Here is a clear case of Soviet imperialism that gives proof to the lie of Soviet propaganda.

This, in brief, is the message that Lithuanian independence conveys to the outer world.

This is the message—a message of tyranny, oppression, inhumanity—that we bring to the free world when we pause for these few moments to pay tribute to Lithuania.

I join with all of you here today in commemorating this anniversary of a great and heroic people. Lithuanians deserved a far better fate than their subjugation to Moscow. But, I know as indeed all of you know that, however oppressive may be the burdens of Soviet domination, however grim may be the prospects for happiness in the future,



however distressing may be their trials and tribulations, the people of Lithuania will resist; they will survive as a nation; they will live on; they will preserve the glorious idea of nationhood that is Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, as an extension to my remarks today I would like to include a copy of a letter sent by the Honorable George W. Ball, Acting Secretary of State, dated February 7, 1965, to the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, February 7, 1965.

Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,  
Chargé d'Affaires ad Interim of Lithuania.

DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's National Day I am pleased to express to you the sincere good wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

Nearly 25 years have elapsed since the sovereign Lithuanian nation lost its national independence in the wake of the illegal annexation by the Soviet Union. But the indomitable spirit of the Lithuanian people and their yearning to live in freedom and independence have not been dimmed throughout these years.

In recognition of the right of a free people to national self-determination, the U.S. Government has firmly and consistently stood by its declared policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The United States thereby not only accords recognition to the Lithuanian people's devotion to the cause of freedom and national independence, but expresses its confidence that this cause will ultimately prevail.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BALL,  
Acting Secretary.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for taking this time so we might pause to remember this important day in the history of Lithuania and in the cause of freedom.

Forty-seven years ago the courageous people of Lithuania won their independence and for a little more than two decades they shared a place with the free men of the world. In 1940 their freedom was ruthlessly taken from them by the tyranny of Joseph Stalin, but their love for freedom could not be extinguished. Nor shall we who are fortunate to retain our freedom forget our friends of Lithuania because they lost theirs. We shall continue to reserve for them their rightful place in the free world.

But remembering is not enough. Paying tribute to those brave Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain is not enough. Nor is paying tribute to the Lithuanian Americans who have and continue to contribute so much to our society enough. Much more needs to be done. That is why I have joined my colleagues in introducing legislation to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations—a committee that would focus year-round

attention on developing and pursuing policies that will help regain independence for the peoples of all captive nations.

I have also introduced legislation urging the President to bring the plight of the Baltic States before the United Nations requesting that the Soviet Union withdraw their troops and return all Baltic exiles from Siberia to their homeland. This legislation would also call for free elections under United Nations supervision in Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

A few days ago I had the pleasure to attend a celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day in my hometown of Amsterdam, N.Y. The enthusiasm of the people, the beautiful costumes, and the warmth of the occasion could not help but make everyone there, whether of Lithuanian extraction or not, feel a part of their heritage and feel honored to share with them the cause for the freedom of their relatives and loved ones in Lithuania.

So it is with a special pride that I join in the pledge, which all freemen must share, that we continue to fight to preserve and expand our freedom—realizing that if we are to be truly free the people of Lithuania, as well as all men, must fill their place in the family of independent nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we should pause today to commemorate an event that occurred 47 years ago in the homeland of a valiant Baltic people, one whose sufferings since the early part of World War II mark one of the grimmest chapters of modern history.

On February 16, 1918, following more than a century of oppression under czarist Russia, Lithuania was at last able to proclaim its independence. For 22 brief but memorable years, marked by great progress, the Lithuanian people breathed the exhilarating air of national independence. But this period of freedom was brought to a close in June 1940 as the Soviet Union, faced by an expanding Nazi Germany, violated its agreements with Lithuania and occupied the country, along with its sister Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia. But despite the destruction of Nazi Germany, the Baltic States still remain under tight Soviet control today.

For those of us who have never had to live under occupation by a totalitarian power, it is difficult to comprehend fully the enormity of the depredations suffered by the people of Lithuania in that most catastrophic period beginning in 1940. The flights of families before the Communist and Nazi invading armies, the retributions and the vengeance of oppressors against patriotic resistance, the losses under air attack, the mass deportations, the mass executions, the sacrifices of Lithuanian freedom fighters struggling against impossible odds—these and a thousand cruel injustices were all heaped upon one small people.

Just think, Mr. Speaker, what some of these statistics mean in a little country of only about 3 million inhabitants:

Some 45,000 Lithuanians deported, many of them never to be heard of again,

during the initial period of Soviet rule in Lithuania in 1940 and 1941.

About 200,000 including almost the entire Jewish population of Lithuania, exterminated during the period of Nazi occupation from June 1941 through July 1944.

About 80,000 Lithuanians fleeing to Western zones of Germany as the advancing Soviet armies again approached Lithuania in July of 1944.

Some 60,000 Lithuanians found by the Soviets in Eastern Germany and sent to Siberia.

About 1,700 Lithuanians executed by the Communists following mass trials, many because of their activity in the Lithuanian underground and their opposition to Soviet rule.

Nearly 145,000 Lithuanians deported by the Communists in 1945 and 1946.

Nearly 12,000 resistance fighters killed, according to the statement in February 1949 of a Communist official in Lithuania, who admitted that the struggle against Lithuanian resistance was still continuing.

About 60,000 Lithuanians deported in March 1949 following passive resistance by the farm population to the collectivization of agriculture.

These figures do not of course begin to tell the whole story, but they do, I believe, make one thing painfully clear: After these and other population shifts and mass killings, there can hardly be an adult Lithuanian who has not felt the Nazi- or Soviet-caused loss of loved ones, through separation or death. The harrowing example of Lithuania since 1940 is an appalling human tragedy, deeply felt by the million Americans of Lithuanian extraction, and directly experienced by the thousands of Lithuanians who have come to this country since World War II.

Such an experience would have broken the spirit of any people less staunchly patriotic than the Lithuanians. The world can never undo the suffering which has been the lot of this brave little land, but we can work for the day when Lithuanians are again free to join in the celebration of independence day on their native soil.

It is gratifying to me that our Government has never recognized the Soviets' incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my hopes and prayers to those expressed today that Lithuanian independence will be restored in the shortest possible time.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, Lithuanians everywhere are celebrating the 47th anniversary of their independence.

In 1918, Lithuania shook off 120 years of czarist rule and became a free self-governing land. But the light of freedom in this small and proud nation was snuffed out in 1940 when she was trampled upon by the heel of Communist Russia.

During her 22 short years of freedom, Lithuania's accomplishments were outstanding. In the field of education, the number of her primary schools nearly quadrupled; over 100 secondary schools were built; and over 4,000 advanced stu-

dents enrolled in the University of Kaunas. Culturally, every city in Lithuania of more than 5,000 people supported opera seasons and gave all an opportunity to hear the world's greatest artists and operas. Industry and commerce soared, and nearly everyone with any ambition had his own home or farm.

This, briefly, is what freedom wrought in 22 years for the Lithuanian people.

Today, they are again suffering under the cruel hardships of Russian imperialism. But we can be sure from the past history of the Lithuanian people that, although they may be persecuted and their land devastated, their courage and spirit lives on. Their devotion to freedom is indestructible. Recalling Lithuania's past heroic history, we can understand why she will and must with our help and the help of God regain her freedom.

On this day, the 47th anniversary of their independence, we extend our message of hope to the people of Lithuania, and once again renew our vow to persevere in working for the independence of their homeland. May we pray that divine providence will speed the day of destruction of Communist tyranny in Lithuania so its people may again enjoy liberty and peace, and she can take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania have suffered many long years of foreign oppression. Today they remain under the yoke of Soviet imperialism, incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Forty-seven years ago the Lithuanian people achieved independence after 120 years of czarist domination followed by a brief period of occupation by the Germans during World War I. No sooner had the Germans evacuated than the newly formed Red army invaded and installed a puppet government. But in 1920 the Communists were driven out by Lithuanian and Polish forces.

In the treaty between independent Lithuania and Russia, the Soviets renounced for all time any claim of sovereignty over Lithuania. Through the benefit of hindsight we now know all too well that the Communists will not hesitate to violate any solemn agreement in order to bring more and more people and territory under their control.

But at that time, the Lithuanian people had every reason to look forward to a much deserved era of national development in freedom and self-respect. The enlightened leaders of Lithuania established a progressive constitutional democracy, recognized by the major nations of the world.

But troubles continued to plague this tiny nation surrounded on all sides by more powerful neighbors determined to destroy Lithuanian independence, in spite of her desire to remain neutral, and the fact that she threatened no one. In March of 1939 the Nazis delivered an ultimatum, demanding the city of Memel, which was yielded.

When the Nazis and the Soviets concluded their agreement, the Communists were then given a free hand to take over Lithuania, in spite of the earlier treaty

and a subsequent nonaggression pact signed in 1926. The Soviets occupied Lithuania in 1940 and absorbed it into the Soviet Union.

The pattern of World War II was repeated; Lithuania suffered under the wartime occupation of the Nazis and then the return of the Red army. The tiny nation was exploited economically, and many of its citizens were liquidated and deported.

In spite of these unending series of disasters the Lithuanians have never relinquished their love of freedom, their desire for independence. All attempts to extinguish the Lithuanian spirit of liberty will fail, as they have in the past.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest national groups in Europe. Centuries ago, late in the Middle Ages, they established an independent state in northeastern Europe, on the eastern shore of the Baltic. They had their glorious days but in modern times fate has not been kind to them. Toward the end of the 18th century the country became part of the Russian Empire, and Lithuanians its discontented subjects. These liberty-loving and independent-minded people were never reconciled to the czarist regime, and during the First World War when that regime was shattered, Lithuanians saw their dream come true. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence and set up their own democratic form of government. Soon that government was duly recognized by other sovereign states, and Lithuania was admitted into the community of free and independent nations. In the course of two decades, during the interwar years, industrious and energetic Lithuanians made their homeland a prosperous, progressive and happy land in which everyone was enjoying full political, economic, and religious freedom.

All this was suddenly transformed very early in the last war when they were robbed of their freedom. In mid-1940 Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then these stouthearted souls have been suffering under alien tyranny and have been longing for their freedom. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we all hope for their freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, national ideals and national goals vary greatly among different nations, depending on their economic, social, and cultural status, on the geographic location of their countries, on their human and natural resources, and also on the political maturity of their respective peoples, and especially of their leaders. And there are no limits to the number of ways by which such ideals may be realized, such goals may be attained. But for the realization and attainment of any, or all national ideals and goals there is one categorical prerequisite, one indispensable condition: nations and peoples aiming to attain certain great goals must have the freedom to develop the maximum capabilities of their citizens in many spheres of productive and creative activity. That makes the difference between conditions in free societies, and

those prevailing in closed and rigidly regimented and practically enslaved societies and, that itself marks and distinguishes individualist, independent-minded peoples from those downtrodden and oppressed under tyrannical regimes.

The Lithuanian people had their goals and ideals, and they had been working for their realization when late in the 18th century they were robbed of their freedom, thus bringing to a halt all their efforts to that end. After suffering under Russia's czarist regime for more than 100 years, they then attained their goal by proclaiming their independence on February 16, 1918. That day marked the most glorious event in Lithuanian modern history. But they did not enjoy their freedom for long. At first it seemed that Hitler's Nazis were threatening Lithuania's independence, but after the outbreak of the last war, it was the Red army of the Soviet Union that treacherously robbed Lithuanians of their freedom and then enslaved them under communism. Today they are still suffering under Communist tyranny. The significance of the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is to keep alive the spirit of freedom and independence among the Lithuanian people and inspire them with some hope for their eventual freedom. I will gladly do my best to do everything possible to see these people attain their national goal, their independence.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of pride and sorrow. Pride, because it was on February 16, 47 years ago, that the people of Lithuania, after a history scarred by oppression, threw off the yoke of tyranny and proclaimed their independence. And sorrow, because freedom had but a short day in Lithuania.

In 1940 this tiny Baltic State was caught between the menacing pincers of the Soviet Union on one side and Nazi Germany on the other. It was Lithuania's fate to fall under the heel of both tyrants. The Russian Bolsheviks marched in that year, and except for a 3-year occupation by Hitler, have kept Lithuania under Communist rule ever since.

Though their liberty has been cruelly snuffed out, we must never turn our backs on these courageous people who have paid the heavy price of living under Communist oppression.

While they no longer are free to live their own lives in dignity, to enjoy their own culture, to pursue their own political, economic, and social institutions, they have never lost their hope for a free future.

Let us, therefore, on this day pledge that their cause will not be forgotten as long as they are not free.

As the late President Kennedy once said in a memorable speech:

Together we must work to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are not free to reestablish their old ties to freedom and the West, so that their desire for liberty and sense of nationhood will survive for future expression. We ask those who would be our adversaries to understand that in our relations with them, we will not bargain one nation's interest against another's and that the commitment to the cause of freedom is common to us all.



Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. Although the Lithuanian independence was short lived, it remains the hope of liberty-loving peoples throughout the world that there will come a day when the people of Lithuania will be released from the yoke of Soviet Communist power.

In our annual observance here, we give encouragement to a gallant little nation which has been officially silenced temporarily, but whose leaders in exile have won our admiration and are deserving of our encouragement in their continuing fight to regain their human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as their properties and business enterprises which have been confiscated.

In my experience in public service, both in Connecticut and in the Congress, and in my work with the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have worked with many Americans of Lithuanian origin, and with many Lithuanians in America and in Europe, and I have become convinced of the sincerity of their purpose and the strength of their desire for freedom. Truly, they are suppressed and oppressed, but so long as the flame of freedom burns before them they will not succumb totally to Soviet enslavement.

With permission to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a letter received by me this week from the Most Reverend V. J. Brizgys, of 2701 West 68th Street, Chicago, Ill., 60629, the bishop of Kaunas, Lithuania.

In the words of Bishop Brizgys:

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

Representative J. S. MONAGAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has always been my great honor and pleasure to express at least a brief note of thanks, appreciation and respect to those friends of Lithuania who, on February 16—the Independence Day of Lithuania—affirm their friendship and sympathy to the Lithuanian nation. Inasmuch, as I shall not be in the United States on February 16 of this year, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation in advance to all who will remember Lithuania on her Independence Day.

I also would like to share with you the most recent news from Lithuania. The Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forcible Russification continues. Greater pressure upon teachers, officials, and judges, to be propagandists for godless atheism, is stressed. Those practicing their faith are constantly persecuted. Lithuanian youth is still being drafted for labor in Siberia. Including survivors of the first mass deportations, these new transportees comprise approximately 130,000 forcibly exiled from their homeland.

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world. It hopes that by its own efforts and the aid of its good friends it will realize freedom and justice in the near future.

They have no desire to be a slave of Moscow, but long to be a member of the family of free nations of the world.

In the name of the Lithuanian nation allow me to thank all of you who support its hopes and actively seek to bring them to reality.

Faithfully yours,

Most Rev. V. J. BRIZGYS.

I also wish to include, with your permission Mr. Speaker, a letter from Mr. Leonard Valiukas, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States. Mr. Valiukas makes reference in his letter to House Concurrent Resolution 99 which I have filed in behalf of the peoples of the Baltic States—Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

In further recognition of the esteem in which we hold these gallant people, I include a copy of Mr. Valiukas' letter, and the text of House Concurrent Resolution 99:

AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL  
ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC STATES,  
Los Angeles, February 8, 1965.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Needless to say, I am very grateful to you for your concurrent resolution, concerning the Baltic States, that you recently introduced in the 89th Congress. I can assure you that Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and all other freedom-loving Americans will always remember you for the aforesaid brave and excellent action taken by you in the U.S. Congress.

As you know, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of our country will mark three important anniversaries next week. They will be observing the 714th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State; they will mark the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom, when Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first King of the Lithuanian empire; and they will remember the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

The U.S. Congress will mark the above anniversaries next week. I kindly ask you to take part in the commemoration of the Lithuanian Independence Day in the U.S. Congress next week by making some remarks and urging your colleagues to pass your concurrent resolution. If it is possible, please insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all of your colleagues would be able to familiarize themselves with this very important legislation.

Thank you.

With personal kindest regards.

Sincerely,

LEONARD VALIUKAS,  
Chairman, Board of Directors.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 99

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the

United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion, at appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world public opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that again this year, as in past two decades and more, Lithuanian independence day has to be celebrated outside the country itself by Lithuanians and their friends in all parts of the free world. This has been so because the Communist masters of Lithuania, while at times going through the motion of appearing to relax their tight and inflexible rule there, have never even thought of allowing any such celebration by the Lithuanians themselves. And the Lithuanians, fully aware of the dire consequences which would befall them if they committed any such treasonable act, dare not observe the anniversary of their independence day, except in strictest secrecy. They cherish, of course, the significance and meaning of their independence as fervently as ever. And we in the free world, desirous of echoing their patriotic spirit and of their undying love for freedom, gladly observe their independence day, the Lithuanian independence day.

What is more significant in this connection we in this great Republic, joining hands with our loyal and patriotic citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, have vowed to celebrate Lithuanian national holidays until their liberation from Communist tyranny. Unfortunately we are not in position to say when that will be possible, and we shall be misleading our good friends if we try to inspire them with undue hope prematurely. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day they all may rest assured that the people and the Government will continue to do everything within their power to bring about the freedom of Lithuanians in their homeland.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This is a glorious day in the annals of Lithuanian history; for it was upon this day that freedom and independence once again became a reality for all the peoples of Lithuania.

During the interwar period of 1918-39, Lithuanians exercised their newly won independence in a manner which they felt best could insure their nation's interest. In general, Lithuanian life flourished, politically, economically, culturally and in the realm of religion. Political relations were established with nations of the world, and Lithuanians assumed their obligations to world society

in a manner befitting a respected and enlightened people.

In many ways one can speak of this interwar period of 20 years as a new "golden age" for Lithuania.

But, one of the great misfortunes of modern history was that this age, so beneficial to the welfare of all Lithuanians, came to an end with the coming of World War II.

Within a very short time Soviet military forces conquered Lithuania and her sister Baltic States. The freedom and independence that Lithuania cherished now came to an abrupt end. Never again were Lithuanians able to enjoy their natural right of self-determination.

These are the simple tragic facts:

Lithuania is today a captive nation.

Lithuania enjoys neither freedom nor independence.

Lithuania's destiny is determined not by its own people but solely by the Soviet rulers in Moscow.

On this day of commemoration it is fitting that we pay tribute to heroic Lithuania. It is also fitting, I believe, that we of the free world contemplate this nation's recent history and draw what lessons we can from its unfortunate experience.

First of all, the Lithuanian experience teaches us the durability of the Soviet ideological commitment to conquer other nations of the world.

Soviet Russia has no just claim upon Lithuania. Here is a nation whose national existence has been historically separate from Russia's. They share no common roots. Lithuania's cultural and religious heritage derive from the West and not from the East. Whatever relationship existed during the modern era, except for the interwar period, had been one of the conqueror toward the conquered. In every respect—politically, culturally, linguistically, socially, economically, and religiously—Lithuania is a nation foreign to the traditions of Russia. Yet, the Soviets conquered Lithuania, and the driving force that brought about this conquest was the singularly motivated ideological commitment to expand communism and conquer the world.

This is one lesson that we can learn from the Lithuanian experience.

It is a lesson we ought never to forget.

Another lesson for us to draw from the history of the Lithuanian conquest is that of the methods used by the Soviets to advance the goals of communism.

The conquest of Lithuania was carried out by the armed forces of the Soviet Union. Without provocation and thus without just cause, the Soviets first imposed their will on the Lithuanians by compelling them to accept a humiliating agreement, requiring partial Soviet military occupation, and then within a few short months launched a large-scale military invasion conquering the entire country.

What followed the military conquest of Lithuania is consistent with the Soviet behavior in Eastern Europe at the end of the war.

Rigged elections took place in which a one-slate choice was presented to the people. Through terror and intimidat-

tion these Lithuanian people were forced to cast their near 100 percent vote for the Communists or those doing their bidding. Forthwith a new government was established that called upon the Soviet Union to take Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. as a constituent republic. From then on, the process of direct Sovietization took place. All political opposition was destroyed or silenced through murder, deportation, or intimidation. The Soviet state structure was imposed upon the country and the Soviet Constitution adopted. All cultural and religious activities were reordered to serve the ends of communism. Ironclad demands of Socialist realism were imposed upon the nation's cultural life, and any hopes for continuing a separate national culture were totally destroyed. From then on, Lithuanians were forced to shed their own national identity and take on that of Soviet Russia. Religious institutions and religious beliefs suffered from the most overpowering forms of discrimination. Society as a whole was made to conform to the rigid requirements of communism wherein every aspect of social life was ordered according to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism. In a similar manner the Lithuanian economy was thoroughly communized, and all the economic resources of the nation were brought under the total control of the Soviet state.

In a word, Lithuania became a conquered colony of the Soviet Union.

This is what has happened to Lithuania; this is the genuine tragedy that has befallen its peoples. Theirs is a tragedy that we of the West must look upon with anguish, but it is also a tragedy from which we can learn vital lessons in dealing with the Communists, lessons that can guide us in these dangerous days of cold war.

Let us, therefore, never forget this lamentable tragedy of Lithuania.

Let us always hold before mankind her lessons for the free, if freedom is to be maintained.

On this occasion of the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us rededicate ourselves to the principles of universal freedom. Let all of us raise our voices in a common expression of hope that the people of Lithuania will one day share the blessings of liberty and that they will one day gain for themselves the natural right of self-determination.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 Lithuanians in America and the free world observe the occasion of Lithuania's anniversary of independence—a condition that no longer exists today. Their countrymen are held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

The history of Lithuania is one of growth, development, oppression, of independence, and domination. For many centuries Lithuania was a part of a powerful kingdom in the whole of Eastern Europe. In the late 16th century this kingdom was united with that of the Poles. This union lasted for 200 years. At the end of the 18th century, Poland was partitioned and ceased to exist. Lithuania, sharing a similar fate, became part of the Russian Empire.

For more than 100 years the Lithuanians fought czarist oppression and

worked vigorously to keep the national spirit breathing. It was during World War I that the Lithuanians proclaimed the birth of the Lithuanian Republic on February 16, 1918.

Their much sought after independence and freedom lasted for two decades and during this time the nation flourished economically and culturally. The Second World War became imminent and the Lithuanian Republic was geographically fated for it was juxtaposition to Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. The Soviet Union occupied the country and in July of 1940, Lithuania was dissolved into the Soviet Union.

The tragedy of this nation is a page of history—not the prologue of the Communist doctrine. The body of man can be held in bondage but his spirit is immune to chains that enslave his body—awkward in oppression, graceful in freedom.

Let us today reassure these physically bonded members of the family of man that we in America and the free world are enslaved when one member is denied the freedom of expression, of hope, of peace.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in observing the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Today marks my 30th consecutive year in the participation of the observance of the independence of Lithuania.

Lithuania has had not only a glorious, but a tragic history extending back to the 11th century.

Lithuania's history is divided into five major periods; namely, the period as a grand duchy from 1316 to 1572; then as a grand duchy when it was united with the Kingdom of Poland 1572–1795; and when Lithuania was occupied by Germany and Russia in 1795 to 1915; and as a Republic from 1918 to 1940; and at present as a component Soviet of the U.S.S.R. since 1940. The Gediminus dynasty began in 1316 as the rulers of the grand duchy of Lithuania. With the death of Sigismund Augustus in 1572 the dynasty which had ruled Lithuania for 2½ centuries became extinct.

By the terms of the Union of Lublin, the grand duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland were united, but they each remained sovereign states as equal partners in a confederation or a commonwealth, with one ruler. In 1573, Henry of Valois, son of Catherine de Medici and the Duke of Anjo, was elected King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania. This arrangement endured for over 200 years until the third and final partition by Austria, Germany, and Russia in 1795, of Poland and Lithuania.

The period of 120 years during which the major portion of Lithuania remained under Russian occupation was characterized by the constant efforts on the part of the Lithuanians to regain their right to direct their own political, cultural, and economic destinies. Following the revolts, 1831 and 1863, the tsarist government attempted to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with Russian, but the Lithuanians resisted these attempts and remained faithful to their



religion, language, and traditions. This policy was abandoned by Russia in 1905.

That portion of Lithuania which fell under German control was treated better by being allowed to maintain their language and customs. But with the rise of Bismarck in 1860 this policy was changed to one of Germanization of the people of Lithuania.

Russia's domination of Lithuania ended in 1915 during World War I when German armies overran Lithuania. In 1917 the German Government authorized the Lithuanians to hold a congress with a membership of 200 delegates. The congress recommended an independent Lithuania with its capitol to be at Vilnius, and elected a council made up of 20 members. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles. Independence was not yet a reality, however, as soon as the German troops evacuated Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red Army entered the city and installed a Communist government. The next year the Red Army was driven out by the Polish Army led by Marshal Pilsudski, and Lithuanian fighting units.

Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation, and renounced forever all rights of sovereignty.

Under a provisional constitution, Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania. The Constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. Mr. Smetona was President from 1919 to 1920, and from 1926 to 1940.

During the period of independence, great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. In addition, industrialization progressed. In 1913 Lithuania had only 151 industrial plants with 6,600 employees, while in 1939 there were over 1,600 plants employing 33,000 workers.

Lithuania also made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures. Great progress was made in education, whereas there were only 1,173 grammar schools in 1930, in 1939 there were 2,328. The number of secondary schools increased from 40 in 1920 to 123 in 1927. In 1938 the University of Vytautas the Great had a student body of over 3,000. In addition, Lithuania literature flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of Lithuania, and achievements were made in opera and music.

In World War II, Lithuania was one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and the Soviet Union. On June 15, 1940, the Soviets demanded formation of a friendly government and occupied the country. In July 1940 a rigid election produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. When the tide of the war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned

not to independence but to Soviet domination.

When the Soviets retook the country in 1944, some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to Western Germany. Another 60,000 were found in Eastern Germany and deported to Siberia. During 1945 and 1946 an additional 145,000 Lithuanians were deported. Still another massive deportation occurred when some 60,000 Lithuanians were deported in March 1949.

It is reported that since Stalin's death that about one-third of those deported have been permitted to return home. Most of the others, it is believed, perished in the meantime.

In reference to U.S. policy toward Lithuania, the United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized the nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent government, which has a legation in Washington.

The Lithuanian World Congress, meeting in August of 1958 under the auspices of the American Lithuanian community, adopted a unanimous resolution declaring that "Lithuanians continue to fiercely resist the alien rule of the Soviet Union" and asserting "that Lithuanians have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." The resolution called upon the free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom." It asked that the free nations "not to be party to any agreement or treaty that would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly Lithuanian state."

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and a Member of the 89th Congress, I subscribe to the resolution and pledge adherence thereto.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1918, was the Independence Day of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. Unfortunately, the independence won with such hardihood 47 years ago was temporarily extinguished a little more than 2 decades later when the land which has produced so many fine American citizens was overcome, in turn, by Nazi Germany and Red Russia.

The spirit that eventually will reestablish liberty for the Lithuanians burned bright in that tragic period and all patriotic Americans should be happy to know, still burns bright today. It may be predicted that the spirit eventually will prevail and the Lithuanian people will once again be free to mingle with their brothers who love liberty and abhor dictatorship.

In many parts of the United States this spirit has been celebrated as this anniversary approached by many who honor the belief in liberty that inspired George Washington and others of our forefathers. As an example, one of the rallies in my own great State was held in Detroit's Cobo Hall, with the dignitaries of the region participating, just last Sunday.

In paying tribute to this heroic people we pay tribute to our own patriots and

all everywhere who keep lighted the lamp of liberty in defiance of tyranny.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today is Lithuanian Independence Day, and I am proud to be able to take part in our observance of the occasion.

To the Lithuanian people, who have enjoyed freedom for only two decades since the late 18th century, independence day stands out in their turbulent history as the brightest landmark. It symbolizes the realization of many of their national ideals. They feel they are missing part of their heritage if they do not, or are not allowed, to celebrate their independence day.

The Lithuanians are not alone in harboring such intense feelings about their independence day celebration; a similar feeling is shared by other people who find themselves in a similar predicament. But today, Mr. Speaker, we single out the significance of Lithuanian Independence Day, because it was 47 years ago today they proclaimed their freedom and independence.

That was almost half a century ago, and since then the world they knew has undergone tremendous changes. Their Lithuanian Republic was lost during World War II. If nothing more, we should assure the Lithuanian people on the 47th anniversary of their independence that we shall not forget their cause and that we share their hopes that one day they will again be able to proclaim their freedom and independence.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence in 1918. After more than a century of Russian domination, and repeated attempts by the Russians to replace the Lithuanian culture with their own, the Lithuanian people gave historic proof that their cherished way of life and their intense love of freedom could never be destroyed. In July 1920 Russia recognized Lithuania as an independent nation and renounced all rights of sovereignty. In 1921 Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations.

Unfortunately, just as the First World War resulted in Lithuania's independence, the Second World War brought a return of Russian domination. Ignoring a treaty of nonaggression which it had signed with Lithuania in 1926, as well as its recognition of Lithuanian independence, the Soviet Union forced a mutual assistance treaty upon Lithuania in 1939 and in 1940 declared Lithuania to be a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Freedom once again was lost to the Lithuanian people except as an inspiring memory and a goal to be regained.

Today the Soviet leaders are continuing in the footsteps of the czars in trying to make the Soviet language and culture prevail over those of the Lithuanians. Many Russian colonists have been moved into Lithuania, and they make little effort to learn Lithuanian although the Lithuanians must learn Russian. Moreover the Soviets make every effort to replace the deep religious beliefs of the Lithuanians with their own militant atheism.



It is my hope that our observance of the anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence in 1918 will provide a ray of hope to the Lithuanians who deplore the Communist system and long to live in freedom once again. I join with the many Americans of Lithuanian descent, who have contributed so much to our own country, in restating that the plight of Lithuania has not been forgotten. I join with all Americans in renewing our determination to maintain and strengthen freedom around the globe.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, once again, on this historic occasion, I join with my colleagues here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to mark the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania and to pay deserved tribute to the founders of that Republic.

It was on February 16, 1918, that the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence—an independence which we all know was destined to be short lived. After only 22 years of existence this valiant nation was overrun by the Red tidal wave and since then the usual communistic pattern of acute, cruel suffering of her people has continued.

Any attempt to recite in detail the many highlights of Lithuania's great history would certainly be beyond my ability. The story has been told and retold. The valiant deeds of Lithuanian men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again—particularly those deeds of fathers and mothers who have kept alive the fire of freedom which was Lithuania's first love. So also the deeds of children who refused to let Lithuania die in spite of the most concerted efforts in history to destroy all trace of a nation and a people.

The contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country. Their contribution has been magnificent and I am proud that so many of them are citizens of my State of Rhode Island.

To the many persons of Lithuanian descent and origin I extend my congratulations on this—the anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On this day, of so much significance to all Lithuanians, I join my hopes with theirs that their mother country may soon be delivered from its present domination and become again a free and independent nation.

And on this day of such significance I can think of no more direct contribution I can make to the cause of peace than to reintroduce the concurrent resolution which I submitted to the previous Congress. This resolution provides that the Senate and the House of Representatives request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and asks that the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It also urges the United Nations to request that the Soviets return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union. It further provides that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the people of the Baltic States.

I am pleased to reintroduce this resolution and I hope that it receives the speedy concurrence of both Houses of this Congress.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. But there is no celebration in the homeland, except perhaps secretly; for Lithuania has fallen a victim to the expansive thrust of Soviet Russian imperialism.

Throughout their long history as an industrious and peace-loving people, the Lithuanians have suffered many cruel persecutions of their culture and endured many ruthless attacks upon their independence. But their burning desire to live their lives in liberty and freedom has never faltered.

The anniversary we celebrate today marks the reemergence of an independent Lithuanian nation whose history stretches back over many centuries. The Lithuanian people made their first appearance on the stage of history long before the arrival of Christianity in the area of the Baltic Sea.

By the Middle Ages, the Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tartars. They furnished a power and government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Muscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with human freedoms unknown in neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration and played their part in the general development of European civilization.

Finally, however, their country was overwhelmed by superior numbers and lost its independence. Nevertheless, the spirit of the people did not die and since 1794 there has not been a single generation of Lithuanians that did not take up arms in a desperate effort to recover their lost liberty.

In 1918, the Lithuanians achieved this goal and, once again, their country was free. It played its part in the League of Nations. It worked for the well-being of its citizens, and the remarkable progress that was made during 22 years was gratifying to all progressive people. The way seemed open for the nation to move modestly and steadily on the path of progress along with the other peoples of Europe and the world.

Then came the catastrophe. In World War II, Lithuania was ravaged by the totalitarian forces of the right and of the left, by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. With the end of the war, the country was left to the mercies of the

Communist aggressors. Under the iron heel of Communist despotism, her population is being decimated, her citizens are being deported and executed, and total annihilation menaces the entire nation.

The situation is a disgrace to Christendom. It is a black spot on the conscience of humanity and makes a travesty of those principles which the democratic countries entered the war to vindicate.

We join them in prayer that God, in His infinite wisdom, may speed the day of deliverance from Communist tyranny and that their beloved country may be restored to its rightful place of honor in the family of free nations.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on the 47th anniversary of their independence. This was a goal for which the Lithuanians had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination.

During its 22-year period of independence, this Baltic State adopted a constitution which guaranteed the people freedom of speech, religion, and assembly. In addition, great strides were made in improving agriculture; industrialization progressed; Lithuanian literature flourished; and achievements were made in opera and music.

In 1940, however, the Russians, in violation of a peace treaty, declared Lithuania a constituent Republic of the U.S.S.R. Since that time, the Lithuanians have been denied their sovereign rights as a free people; many thousands have been deported to Siberia; and thousands have been brutally murdered. Despite these hardships and atrocities, these courageous people have never given up the fight for the freedom that once was theirs.

So today, on this solemn occasion, let us hope that their valor will soon have its just reward in liberty.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if one looks at a new map of the world he will find no international boundaries delineating the area on the earth's surface once known as Lithuania. One will unsuccessfully search the census tomes of Europe for a recent statistical description of the Lithuanian peoples. Newspapers carry no dateline from Lithuania. Mr. Speaker, the Government of the United States recognizes the independent State of Lithuania, but in the world of real politics 1965, news from Lithuania is actually Russian news, Lithuanian population statistics are now incorporated into Russian census figures, and the border of Lithuania is the Russian border.

How this anomaly of international politics came about is an integral part of today's commemoration ceremony. The country known as Lithuania came into existence shortly after 1200 and by the end of the 15th century the little country was not only well-known but highly respected throughout Europe. A royal marriage in 1385 and a treaty of 1569 brought Lithuania and Poland into a union which lasted for about 300 years. During the partitions of Poland at the end of the 18th century, Lithuania was incorporated into czarist Russia where



it remained until after the First World War.

While the people of Lithuania had long dreamed of regaining their independence it was not until World War I and the Russian Bolshevik Revolution that this dream had a chance to materialize. By the middle of February 1918 a Lithuanian state council proclaimed the country free and independent. The following month, March 1918, the Russo-German Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed and the Germans recognized Lithuania *de jure*. In the years following, the Lithuanian people, not experienced with self-rule, tried to build a new government out of the ashes of their history. In the early months and years of this new struggle the little country was invaded by and had to fight with the Poles, the Russians, and the Germans.

In 1920 the new Communist Government in Russia signed a treaty with Lithuania in which it stated:

Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences \* \* \* and for all time renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia, which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

How could anyone know the mockery Stalin would make of this international promise on June 15, 1940, when Russian troops occupied the country. Exactly 1 month later, on July 14 and 15, the Russians showed an incredible scorn for democratic institutions by forcing the people of the country to vote in a rigged election, and then announcing the results before the polls closed by telling the world that more than 99 percent of the people had voted. The following day the new assembly without a vote being taken, asked the Soviet Union to accept Lithuania as the 14th state in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The date was July 21, 1940.

During World War II Lithuania was occupied by the Germans for almost 3 years. The brutal control of the Fascists was only a continuation of the Communist regime. At the end of the war Lithuania was reoccupied by the Russians. The U.S. Government does not recognize the incorporation of the Lithuanian state into the U.S.S.R.

Whether Lithuania will regain its independence will be decided by the future events of world history and the destiny of Russian communism.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay homage to the courageous people of Lithuania, who have kept alive the flame of liberty despite 2½ decades of subjugation and oppression. Lithuania rightfully took its place among the independent nations of the world on February 16, 1918, when the people proclaimed their independence.

For more than a century Lithuania had suffered under the tyrannical rule of the czars; and the Russian revolutions of 1917 provided an opportunity to announce the realization of an age-old dream. This dream, however, turned into a nightmare 22 years later as Lithu-

ania was swallowed up by the octopus of international communism.

Up to this very day the subjugation of Lithuania continues. Through mass deportations of Lithuanian patriots and their replacement by Russian immigrants the Soviet Union has attempted to stamp out forever any trace of a free and independent Lithuania. The citizens of this courageous nation have never faltered in their burning desire for freedom and independence and will continue their fight to become once again a free and sovereign state.

To this day the United States has refused to recognize the absorption of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Like other freedom-loving people the world over, we believe that every man and every country has the inalienable right of liberty. We as Americans look with admiration at the inspiring example of resistance and determination shown by the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, and once again denounce the Soviet Union for its failure to atone for its brutality and outright imperialism under Stalin.

We need only look at the contributions of the Lithuanians in America to give us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that the confidence and faith in Lithuania's future has been well placed.

The regime imposed on Lithuania has violated everything which freemen hold dear. That it has not been a complete success in its endeavor is due only to the strong, inborn love the Lithuanian people have for the cherished principle of national independence.

The soul of Lithuania lives today. It lives in the hearts of Lithuanian patriots still enslaved in their homeland. It lives in the minds of Lithuanians all over the globe. The soul of Lithuanian freedom in fact lives in the hearts and minds of freedom-loving people everywhere, and we would be untrue to our American heritage if we did not do everything in our power to sustain and encourage it.

Today Lithuania is fighting for the same cause as all other freedom-loving peoples. Her people want only to live in their own country under their own government. On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with my colleagues in Congress and with the American people in the fervent hope that in the near future Lithuania will be allowed to take its rightful place among the free nations of the earth.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago the ancient nation of Lithuania proclaimed her independence. The history of the Lithuanian people is an epic story of heroism and suffering in their attempts to assert their sovereignty. The Lithuanians are a proud and highly civilized people who have fought in the past for their independence and will continue to struggle now and in the future until they have reattained this goal.

On February 16, 1918, still under German occupation and confronted with the new menace of bolshevism, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously adopted a declaration calling for the reestablishment of an independent Lithu-

anian state on a democratic basis. It was not long, however, before the newborn state was invaded by the Russian army. In a series of heroic battles, Lithuanian patriots were able to defeat the Bolshevik invaders and hurl them back across their ancient frontiers.

For the next 22 years, the Soviet Government protested to the world its sincere support of Lithuanian independence and of the independence of other small European nations. Yet in the summer of 1940, faced by an expanding Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union violated its solemn agreements and occupied Lithuania. The Communist police state established at that time has endured till now, interrupted only by the period of Nazi occupation in World War II.

No people has suffered more severely under Soviet occupation than has the people of Lithuania. It is estimated that in the late forties when Stalin's colonialists were consolidating their power, fully 10 percent of the population of Lithuania was arrested by the Soviet secret police and transported to the slave labor camps of Siberia in cattle cars.

Today, the Soviet system has extended into every aspect of Lithuanian life. All means of transportation have been placed in the hands of Soviet officials, and collectivization of agriculture has been forced upon the peasants. In this strongly religious country, repressive measures have been taken against the church including the closing down of seminaries and the systematic liquidation of spiritual leaders.

Lithuania is now a member republic in the Soviet Union. However, Lithuanian affairs in the Supreme Soviet in Moscow are entrusted mostly to Russian agents and Communists nominated by Moscow. Only 50 percent of them are of Lithuanian nationality, and these have been chosen for propaganda reasons to disguise the Russification drive and the Soviet colonial rule in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania have suffered much, but even the weight of the Iron Curtain has not crushed their hopes of freedom nor extinguished the torch of liberty that burns within their hearts. Lithuanians are in the forefront of the battle for national self-determination and the American people will never forget their example of bravery and courage. We hope and pray that someday the people of Lithuania will again be able to enjoy the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and again be allowed to assume their rightful place among the independent nations of the world.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. It is well that we mark this date, for it is a reminder that no matter how rapacious or despotic a government may be, it can never destroy or expunge the desire of a courageous people to regain liberties of which they have once been deprived.

Annexed to the Russian Empire in 1795 during the third partition of Poland, the Lithuanian people expressed their desire for independence throughout the 19th century by a series of revolts against

the government of the czars. In a desperate move to quench the Lithuanian spirit and resolve, a policy of Russification was attempted. But, so strong and determined were the Lithuanians to retain their religion, their language, and their traditions, that even the czarist regime was forced to abandon its policy. In the aftermath of the First World War, this indomitable people succeeded in creating a state, democratic in principle and practice.

For two decades, the new state fared well. Then, in the chaos of the prewar period, its larger neighbors subjected it to pressures and extortion it alone could not withstand. By 1940, the Soviet Union had forced Lithuania to grant air-bases, installed a puppet government, and finally, occupied and incorporated it into the Soviet Union. Since that time, 25 years ago, the Lithuanians have not known any freedom.

The fact that the Lithuanians were once one of the major bulwarks of civilized Europe against the incursions of Asian hordes made them aware of the preciousness of their liberties and national identity. With a courage and will forged out of adversity, they never ceased to fight for their aspirations, their freedom, and their country. They were successful once before. And, we are convinced that, though once again under an inhuman despotism, their valiant struggle will also once again be rewarded. We share the hope and the desire of the Lithuanians to one day become again a free, independent member of world's community of nations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, all peoples are great in their own ways; the gallant and stouthearted Lithuanians have been great as fighters and warriors for their freedom and independence. Having lost these precious possessions late in the 18th century, for more than 100 years they struggled ceaselessly to regain them. Then, toward the end of the First World War when the chain of czarist autocracy which had held them in bondage was shattered, they asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence on February 16, 1918. Thenceforth, for a little more than two decades, until the eve of the outbreak of the last war, they lived and labored happily in their homeland. In that relatively short time they rebuilt their war-torn country, instituted their own democratic form of government, and reestablished many of the age-old Lithuanian institutions. Then the gathering of storms in 1939 cast a black shadow over Lithuania, and it was not long before the Lithuanians became prisoners there under the Soviet regime.

Since the fateful year of 1940 these unhappy people have been robbed of their freedom, and have been suffering under alien tyrants. Particularly since the end of the last war Communist totalitarianism imposed upon them has been tightened by the Kremlin. On the 47th anniversary observance of their independence day we all hope and pray for their deliverance from their heartless oppressors.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today has a special significance for nearly 1

million Americans of Lithuanian origin who will observe the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of their mother country.

After more than a century of Russian domination, Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918. In celebrating this anniversary we give sad recognition to the fact that the independence of the brave Lithuanian people was of but short duration. For over two decades, Lithuania thrived as an independent country, guaranteeing its citizens the rights for which they had struggled so long. Much progress was made in education and social legislation. Literature, music, and the arts flourished. In 1940, this tide of progress was reversed with the beginning of a new era in Russian domination.

The Soviet dictators ignored the pledge they had made 20 years earlier to renounce forever all rights to sovereignty over Lithuania, first by forcing a mutual assistance treaty upon them, then by occupying the country, and finally, by incorporating Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Many Lithuanians fled the country. To those who remained, freedom is still only a dream.

I have taken the floor to voice my praise for the Lithuanian Americans who refuse to accept the relegation of the land of their fathers, with its seven centuries of history, to the past. While hope for eventual restoration of liberty and independence may now seem dim, the prospect of liberation from communism will always remain a growing possibility as long as the people of Lithuanian ancestry remember and hold precious and dear their great heritage. This is particularly true of those Lithuanians who have now become Americans.

I salute them and I assure them of my strongest personal support in seeking the achievement of their aims.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is being celebrated. It is a day of which the Lithuanian people can well be proud. At the same time, it is a period of deep sorrow and regret for these same brave people who have suffered so much and so long under the domination of communism.

The Lithuanian nation, once a kingdom in its own right, and a leader in the cultures and arts of the world for some 700 years, has just reason to be proud of its heritage and background.

In marking this anniversary, we, as citizens of the free world, marvel at the faith and courage of these people who have taken enslavement and bondage with heads held high. Their firm conviction of eventual independence and return to sovereignty and self-determination, is indeed a lesson to us. Their actions give us further reason to assist them in attaining their goal.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Republic have always held Lithuanians in high esteem. Having known them quite intimately in our midst as hard-working, industrious, loyal, and patriotic citizens we have always appreciated their share in the making and shaping of our free and democratic

way of life. So we were overjoyed when Lithuanians in their homeland attained their freedom toward the end of World War I. We watched them with keen interest while they rebuilt their country, established a democratic form of government, and began to enjoy the blessings of their free institutions. In the course of a relatively short time they succeeded in making Lithuania a viable state, a happy abode for its deserving inhabitants. Unfortunately, however, they were not allowed to enjoy their freedom for long. Toward the end of the 1930's as the cloud of war thickened over the horizon, their prospects for continued freedom fell under a shadow. And their worst apprehension about their freedom came true, when the Red army invaded Lithuania, occupied it, and then made it part of the Soviet Union in mid-1940.

Thus came to an end the Lithuanian Republic, two decades after its birth. And all friends of Lithuanians were saddened by their tragic fate. Just as we had shared their joy in the birth of their Republic in 1918, so when it was treacherously annihilated by the Red army, we in this country shared their grief and sorrow. Of course neither then, nor now, have we been in position to aid them effectively so as to have them regain their freedom, but our wholehearted sympathy has been with them. During World War II they were brought under the equally detestable Nazi regime for a while, but toward the end of that war, Communists returned with furor and terror, and they have been overlords there for over 20 years.

Though Lithuania has now become part of the Soviet Union, and thus sealed off from the free world, we are constantly informed of the fate of its people there by our patriotic citizens of Lithuanian descent. Without compromising their loyalty and patriotism to this great republic in any way, they have been very active in enlisting our sympathy for the righteous and sacred cause of the Lithuanian people. In this they are helping to preserve the cause of free peoples everywhere. Today, on the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, I join them in wishing freedom and independence to the Lithuanians.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, wars are generally considered the curse of humanity, because they bring death to innocent people and immeasurable human misery and property destruction. Some people consider revolutions just as bad and dangerous to humanity. But in both cases there are some exceptions. The Russian revolution of 1917, at least initially, seemed to have ushered in a new era for those suffering under czarist Russia's oppressive autocracy. By that revolution many hitherto suppressed nationalities found their freedom and salvation, and nearly all of them proclaimed their independence soon after that world-rocking event. Lithuanian independence was thus a child of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Since the late 18th century, Lithuania had been part of the Russian Empire; and for more than 100 years, Lithuanians had to endure the heavy yoke of Russia's stern and autocratic rule. The



Russian officials during this long period did all in their power to eradicate and uproot all signs and symbols of Lithuanian nationalism. All national celebrations were proscribed; the study and the use of the Lithuanian language was discouraged; any showing of Lithuanian national traits and feelings were viewed with suspicion, and those displaying any sign of independence were closely watched, often facing imprisonment. Yet despite these stern and stringent measures, the Lithuanians retained their national feeling and sensitivity. They venerated their national traditions, clung steadfastly to their national ideals, and longed for their independence. The revolution of 1917 offered them the golden opportunity to attain their goal, to proclaim their independence.

This they did on February 16, 1918, 47 years ago. For the enjoyment of their freedom they worked ceaselessly and tirelessly; and in the course of some two decades, during the interwar years, they rebuilt their ruined and war-ravaged country, making it a model of prosperous and progressive democracy. There they were quite content with their lot and were doing their best to safeguard their long-cherished and newly won freedom. Then came the Second World War, and with it began the most tragic period in Lithuanian history. In the course of its first year that war literally swallowed independent and free Lithuania, and made it, much against the wishes and desires of helpless Lithuanians, part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1940, except for that dark period of World War II when they were under the Nazis, Lithuanians have been oppressed by the Communist regime in the Kremlin. However, even under such conditions of despair, Lithuanians fervently cherish the hope that someday, freedom and independence may come once again to their beloved homeland.

On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, we join them in their prayers for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed honored to participate in this, the 47th anniversary commemorating the independence of the Lithuanian nation. At that time the people of Lithuania launched the greatest and most successful program for self-government and self-determination of any nation in world history.

This declaration of Lithuanian independence was one of the great milestones in the history of a liberty loving people whose struggle for self-government continued over centuries. From the 16th century on, Lithuania was almost in a constant battle against aggressive neighbors, but never gave up hope to preserve the Lithuanian tradition. During 120 years of Russian domination, no less than five distinct major revolts took place in Lithuania. Back in the early 1800's, Czar Nicholas the First invoked a sweeping policy to Russify Lithuania. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, literature, language, schools, religion, and governmental offices. In 1863 and 1864, another revolt took place which failed after

a struggle of 18 months. Another revolution in 1905 brought fresh hopes for independence, but failed. During World War I, the German armies overran the country and remained there until the end of the war. During this time, uprising, negotiations, and minor rebellions did not cease.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously adopted a declaration calling for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as the capital and the severance of all political ties which link it with other nations. This declaration became Lithuania's proclamation of independence.

After the evacuation of Lithuania by Germany in November and December 1918, Russian troops arrived at the border of Lithuania and again made an effort to subjugate the nation. The last battle with the Red army was fought late in 1919 which culminated in a peace treaty signed July 12, 1920.

On September 22, 1921, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, thus Lithuania became a nation with international power. The permanent constitution was adopted August 1, 1922. It was an instrument which followed the blueprint of western democracy. The nation of Lithuania was an independent democratic republic; the people were accorded the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly; the constitution guaranteed freedom of religion; the Lithuanian Government instituted land reform; industrial production proceeded to ascend; neglected railroads were rebuilt and transportation improvement was inaugurated throughout the land; social legislation and education were expanded and it did not take long before the new independent democracy was functioning with the precision of nations much older. The Lithuanian people proved, during the period of time from their declaration of independence up until the Hitler-Stalin menace devastated Europe, that its people could give the world a practical example of true democracy in action. During the period from 1920 to 1939, the Lithuanian Government entered into peace treaties, nonaggression pacts and mutual assistance agreements with all nations including the Soviet Union. By reason of typical and well known Communist duplicity and treachery, every one of these agreements was discarded and nullified by Russia when they saw the opportunity was ripe to enslave the Lithuanian people.

I will not take up the time in these remarks to repeat the treachery, mass murders, prison incarcerations, and tortures that the Soviets inflicted upon the brave and liberty loving people of Lithuania. This history is vividly set out in the summary and final report of the Committee on Communist Aggression filed December 31, 1954. I, as a Member of Congress, served on this committee and we held hearings in America and Europe. Members of Congress and the American public should read that report and learn from former leaders of Lithuania and other witnesses who were victims of Soviet treachery what Communist tyranny can inflict on innocent human beings.

This report also reveals facts containing similar inhuman aggression upon other captive nations now under the Kremlin iron heel. The basic findings, conclusions, and recommendations set out on pages 3 to 9 of that report will startle millions of people throughout the free world when they learn of the true facts concerning the Communist conspiracy.

Over the last 12 years since the report of our Communist-investigating committee, we have sent out hundreds of thousands of copies of our reports to nations, people, and organizations all over the world. Hardly a week passes but what we receive letters asking for copies of the report revealing the great work done by our congressional committee exposing communism in its naked guilt.

Lithuania, along with other captive countries and all free nations, must keep up the fight against Communist aggression and expansion and the day will eventually come when freedom will be restored to Lithuania and other captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I incorporate with my remarks a letter which I have received from the most Reverend Brizgys of 2701 West 68th Street, Chicago, Ill.:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

Representative R. J. MADDEN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has always been my great honor and pleasure to express at least a brief note of thanks, appreciation, and respect to those friends of Lithuania who, on February 16—the Independence day of Lithuania—affirm their friendship and sympathy to the Lithuanian nation. Inasmuch, as I shall not be in the United States on February 16 of this year, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation in advance to all who will remember Lithuania on her independence day.

I also would like to share with you the most recent news from Lithuania. The Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forcible Russification continues. Greater pressure upon teachers, officials, and judges, to be propagandists for godless atheism, is stressed. Those practicing their faith are constantly persecuted. Lithuanian youth is still being drafted for labor in Siberia. Including survivors of the first mass deportations, these new transportees comprise approximately 130,000 forcibly exiled from their homeland.

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world. It hopes that by its own efforts and the aid of its good friends it will realize freedom and justice in the near future. They have no desire to be a slave to Moscow, but long to be a member of the family of free nations of the world.

In the name of the Lithuanian nation allow me to thank all of you who support its hopes and actively seek to bring them to reality.

Faithfully yours,

Most Rev. V. BRIZGYS.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 we commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This year we celebrate the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On February 16, 1918, a congress of Lithuanian delegates proclaimed the country's independence. A democratic government based on individual liberties was set up, and for the next two decades Lith-



uania flourished as an independent nation. The creative arts were encouraged, and the world became richer through Lithuania's contributions to music and literature. National folklore was revived. The standard of living of the Lithuanian people was substantially improved by enlightened educational and social policies.

But Lithuania's period of progress was unfortunately brief, for the Second World War brought national tragedy to the Lithuanian people. In spite of the fact that they had pledged in a 1920 peace treaty to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty over Lithuania, the Soviets occupied Lithuania in June of 1940 and had incorporated Lithuania in the U.S.S.R. by autumn. Thus democracy and freedom were brutally ended, and Lithuania was tragically enslaved. Thousands of citizens were deported, and many others were tyrannized and threatened. Individual liberties and national independence were crushed.

One thing was not destroyed: the desire of the Lithuanians to regain liberty and democracy and their steadfast faith that one day they would again be free. Their own historical past has taught them that a conqueror cannot retain control forever. Lithuania is an old nation, known to history since 1009. During the medieval period, threats from abroad brought together the principalities into which it was divided, and in 1253 Lithuania was united under a single king. Lithuania was a powerful state in Europe during the Middle Ages, with boundaries to the east which extended into what is now the Byelorussian S.S.R. and the Russian S.S.R. It acted as a buffer against the Mongols in the east and the Germans in the west, and played an important role in the development of European civilization.

Then, in 1795 Lithuania was annexed by Russia, and the tolerant, enlightened policies of the Lithuanian rulers were replaced by the repressive policies of the Russian czars. Although the Lithuanians were unable to regain independence until the First World War, czarist Russification policy was unsuccessful. Lithuania then, as now, remained faithful to its language, religion, and tradition.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has known both independence and subjugation, freedom and repression, glory and tragedy. History has shown that the spirit of the Lithuanian people is indomitable. On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we commend the Lithuanian people for their courage.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago today, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was a goal for which they had been striving ever since they had fallen under Russian domination in 1795.

It was not the first time, however, that the Lithuanian people had known independence. Indeed, the Lithuanian nation has been known to history since as long ago as 1009, when the name of Lithuania was first mentioned in a Latin text. For two centuries, Lithuania re-

mained divided into many independent principalities. Following the conclusion of two important peace pacts in 1219 and in 1236, the Lithuanian principalities were united under the single rule of King Mindaugas. In 1251, Mindaugas was baptized a Christian, and 2 years later he was crowned King of a united Lithuania by a delegate of Pope Innocent IV. Thus 714 years ago this year Lithuania became united under Christian rule and 712 years ago this year Lithuania was recognized as a member of the European family of nations by the papacy.

Mr. Speaker, for several centuries the history of the Lithuanian people was glorious. At one time, the domains of the nation stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For centuries, the Lithuanians held back the Germans in their drive from the west and protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tartars pushing from the east. Indeed, the Lithuanian kingdom of the late Middle Ages had a powerful and stable government which sheltered the eastern Slavs and provided them with a freedom that was unknown in the less-developed lands further to the east.

The reign of Vytautas the Great, from 1392 to 1430, is especially celebrated in Lithuanian history. During this period, commerce was fostered, roads were carved out of the countryside, churches were built, education was promoted, and ties between Lithuania and Western Europe were increased. The high level of Lithuanian culture continued after the reign of Vytautas and became renowned throughout Europe. It is interesting to note in this respect that the Lithuanian language is one of the oldest spoken languages in Europe and is closely related to ancient Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin.

As early as the 16th century, the Lithuanian nation was forced to begin to seek ways to counter the growing threat from the Russians to the east. After having lost several eastern provinces to Muscovy, the Lithuanians in 1569 reluctantly agreed to conclude a political union with the equally threatened Poland. Lithuania still retained, however, a separate government, with its own treasury, armed forces, and law courts. Despite external threats and losses of territory, Lithuania's prodigious cultural development continued in the 16th century. Thus in 1529, a Lithuanian code of laws was enacted. In 1557, important measures of agrarian reform were applied. The first book in the Lithuanian language was published in 1547.

The union with Poland insured Lithuanian security for only a short time. Russian aggrandizement at the expense of Lithuania continued for the next century and a half. It culminated in the infamous partitions of Lithuania and Poland of 1772, 1793, and of 1795. For the next 120 years, Lithuania formed a part of the Russian empire. Lithuanian patriotism did not die out, however. The Lithuanian people periodically revolted against their Russian rulers. They fiercely resisted Russian attempts to impose the Russian language, to suppress the Lithuanian press and to force the Lithuanians to follow Eastern Orthodox

rites instead of the rites of the Roman Catholic Church. The peasantry was especially active in resisting the Russians. Lithuanian emigres to America actively supported the Lithuanian cause. In short, Lithuanians were determined to regain their independence. Following 3 years of suffering under German occupation, their opportunity came in the last year of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, for 22 short years, Lithuanians enjoyed their regained independence. Their accomplishments during that period were immense. A far-reaching land reform program was carried out which turned Lithuania into a nation of small, independent and increasingly prosperous farms. Although agricultural progress was stressed, industry was not ignored. In 1913, Lithuania had only 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees; in 1939, there were 16,131 enterprises employing some 33,000 workers. Progressive social legislation was introduced. The number of schools doubled. And above all, Lithuanian culture, freed of the shackles imposed by the Russians, flourished once more.

Following the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact of 1939, history cruelly began to repeat itself for the Lithuanians. Free Lithuania was first swallowed by the new and vicious imperialists of the Soviet Union. It was then occupied by the Nazi armies. It was reoccupied by Soviet armies in 1944. The Soviet Union has remained ever since. Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Russian czars toward the Lithuanian people were cruel and oppressive. They have been exceeded in every respect by those of Lithuania's Soviet masters.

Lithuanians have been deported by hundreds of thousands to remote regions of the Soviet Union where many of them have died. By tens of thousands they have been summarily executed whether they resisted Soviet policies or not. The land of once proud Lithuanian farmers has been subjected to forced collectivization. The Lithuanian Church has been forced virtually to close its doors. Russian colonists have exploited Lithuanian industry. Lithuanian culture is again being suppressed and the Russian language forced upon the Lithuanian people. Lithuania has been almost completely deprived of contact with the Western World.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has turned the nation of Lithuania into a vast prison. Today we pause to lament the loss of Lithuanian independence and the subjection of a proud nation with a glorious history and a rich culture to the cruelest of tyrannies. We also pause to mark a day that is engraved in the memories of all Lithuanians, and to hope that the not too distant future will bring them another such day.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, once again, in this 20th year since the end of World War II, we are compelled to observe that the three small but proud Baltic States remain under the military domination and political control of the Soviet Union, without having yet had an opportunity to set up new free governments and conduct free elections.



The Baltic States, which emerged from foreign sovereignty near the close of World War I, were swallowed up again as World War II approached. During the heat and fury of war, we and other Western nations were promised by the Soviet Government that the Baltic States would be given a fair and free chance to choose for themselves the nature of their postwar political structure. This chance has in fact not been given; the solemn promise has not been redeemed.

We commemorate today the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic of 1918. This republic had a short life but we would be most unwise—and so would those who ravaged her—to think that Lithuania cannot rise again.

The history of Lithuania as a sovereign nation is seven centuries old. It has been an empire in Eastern Europe. Its tradition is, however, clearly that of the West. It is a land in which the words freedom and democracy are understood as we understand them.

We have often in this House expressed our sympathy for the present condition of the peoples of the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—as well as for other peoples still under Soviet control after two decades. Many of us have sponsored resolutions, in repeated sessions of the Congress, declaring our support of the Government's refusal to acknowledge foreign control of the Baltic States to be legitimate and permanent, or justified by law or de facto penetration.

We owe it to Americans of Lithuanian origin or ancestry—brave people and freedom-loving people—to express our sympathy again for the present circumstances of their fatherland. We owe what we owe to all peoples who love liberty and who have, to the best of their ability, kept the faith.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress will consider the advisability of renewing a formal expression of our concern for the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States; of our concern that in the final settlements of the war now two decades gone, the pledge of respect for their self-determination will be honored.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on this, their national independence day.

At the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people, long suppressed by czarist tyranny, were overjoyed by President Wilson's proclamation of the principle of self-determination for all people.

On February 16, 1918, independence was proclaimed and recognition was extended by all the great powers. For 22 years this nation lived and prospered in freedom. Then came the fall of Paris in June 1940. Within a few days the Soviet Union delivered its ultimatum in keeping with the terms of the notorious Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939, and demanded the surrender of Lithuania.

From that day forward the Communists embarked upon a campaign to make Lithuania over in the Soviet image. The hallmarks of Communist oppression

followed. Collectivization of the farms, religious persecution, denial of free speech, assembly, and private property.

The United States openly denounced this illegal occupation and every American administration since has continued the policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet puppet regimes. I trust my Government will never alter that policy.

The conquest of Lithuania is a sad but true reminder that freedom is in constant danger. So long as international communism professes world domination we must be vigilant. We join the Lithuanians in celebrating this independence day and pledge our efforts to hasten the day when freedom returns to the people of Lithuania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, 47 years ago today the nation of Lithuania declared herself independent. For the next 22 years the people of Lithuania progressed and prospered as their centuries-old dream of independence came true. This dream was shattered in the summer of 1940 when Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops and soon was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Lithuania may have been wiped off the map as an independent nation by this act of Soviet imperialism, but it has not been wiped out of the hearts and minds of Lithuanians and friends of freedom. Today in Lithuania, there will be no tears of pride and patriotism at the sight of the Lithuanian flag. Rather, there will be tears of rage and frustration, for the flag of Lithuania is now the hammer and sickle. Lithuanians will not stand at attention and sing their national anthem, because their national anthem has been turned into a dirge for a country suppressed by Soviet tyranny. We can be sure, however, that today Lithuanians will pause, silently, and dedicate themselves anew in their never-ending battle for liberty.

Mr. Speaker, we need not have asked for whom the bell tolled when Lithuania lost her cherished liberty, for it tolled for freedom-loving people all over the world. It tolled for America, the bastion of freedom and democracy, for whenever free men are enslaved, no American can be completely at rest. We would be remiss in our responsibilities as the leaders of the free world if we did not do all we can to honor and to support the resolve of the brave people of Lithuania. I am confident that America shares with me the respect which I feel for the people of Lithuania and my confidence that in the end, right will prevail and Lithuania will once again be free.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the continued subjugation and enslavement of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century. Forty-seven years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania took her long-awaited step toward independence. Lithuanians looked to the future with hope and with infinite confidence in their abilities to govern themselves and to guide their own destiny. Today Lithuania is reduced to an enslaved nation, a nation devoured and stripped of its identity by the onslaughts of the Soviet Union. Where once there was freedom, hope, and progress, there is now oppression, tyranny, and injustice.

During its 22 years of independence, Lithuania thrived as only a free and sovereign nation can. A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. This constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. Great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, for farming is the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted, with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. By 1939, there were 335,720 farming units, raising a variety of grains, potatoes, sugarbeets, livestock, and poultry.

Industrialization also progressed in independent Lithuania with an increase from 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees in 1913, to 16,131 enterprises employing 33,000 in 1939. At the same time, Lithuania made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures.

The arts in Lithuania also flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of their country, and achievements were made in opera and other forms of music. All in all, Lithuania was taking rapid strides in becoming one of the most progressive and dynamic nations in Europe.

This progress came to an abrupt halt when the Soviet Union marched her troops into Lithuania and instituted a regime so cruel and heinous as to defy the imagination. Lithuanians were murdered, tortured, and deported on an enormous scale. It is estimated that on the night of June 14, 1941, some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia, many never to be heard of again.

It is imperative that we in America never forget the tragedy of Lithuania. Indeed there are over 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent who cannot disassociate themselves from the plight of their brothers across the sea. Lithuanian immigrants came to the United States as early as 1688, when it is recorded that they landed at New Amsterdam. Lithuanians make up substantial percentages of the population of my own State of Pennsylvania and of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, these Americans of Lithuanian descent have not forgotten the true meaning of Lithuanian Independence Day, and we as a nation have not forgotten. Lithuania will once again be free. We must do everything in our power to hasten that day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 every year, we join with 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in observing the Lithuanian Independence Day. This year marks the 47th anniversary of the independence proclaimed by the people of their fatherland. It is worth while interrupting the ordinary business of the House at this moment to commemorate this event by honoring their strong courage and ideals, great devotion to the dignity and freedom of individual man and the tenacious



hope that the long-lost independence they once enjoyed will be restored.

Lithuania has been known to history since the early 11th century—an old nation with its glorious 700-year-old cultural and national tradition. The country has a strategic location in northeastern Europe facing the Baltic Sea and abundant natural wealth which has been just enough to motivate foreign aggression against so small a country. During the third partition of Poland in the 18th century, this nation came under the tyrannical yoke of Russia which lasted from 1795 to 1915—over 120 years.

At the end of the First World War, defeat of Germany coupled with the Russian revolution furnished to the freedom-yearning Lithuanians a long-sought opportunity of independence. Thus, on February 16, 1918, 47 years ago this week, the Lithuanian Council in their capital Vilnius proclaimed an independent state based on democratic principles. Failing to enslave Lithuania, Russia signed a peace treaty on July 12, 1920, which accorded full recognition as an independent state and forever renounced all sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory. On September 22, 1921, this tiny nation was admitted to the League of Nations. During her short-lived independence, this small but vigorous and progressive republic grew, prospered, and became a full-fledged member of the international community.

All this came to an end when the Red army forcibly set up a government friendly to the Soviets and occupied the young republic on June 15, 1940, in contravention of a Soviet-Lithuanian non-aggression treaty concluded in 1926. On August 3, 1940, through a phony election, Lithuania was declared by the Kremlin a constituent republic of the Communist Russia. With the outbreak of the war in 1941 came the German invasion, and as the defeated German Army retreated in July 1944, the Red army again marched into Lithuania bringing a new flood of evil totalitarian tyranny and more ferocious terrorism and oppression. The United States recognized an independent Lithuania on July 27, 1922, and refused to recognize the Soviet occupation on July 23, 1940.

Such has been a tragic and trying story of this gallant and proud people, but we have no reason to believe that the soul of a spirited nation has been conquered. They have neither lost nor weakened the inalienable right to hope and struggle for their freedom and independence. The soul of this oppressed people continues to live through the darkness of Communist enslavement, radiating the light of freedom which will never be extinguished by any means.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues at this time in expressing my sentiments regarding Lithuanian Independence Day. The independent state of Lithuania was recently among the smaller countries of Europe, but it was not always a tiny Baltic nation. Lithuania first appeared as an organized political entity some 800 years ago. The Lithuanians and Latvians of the 20th century are the

survivors and descendants of one of the eastern branches of the Indo-European family. In medieval times, the Lithuanian kings ruled most of what is now Russia. After four centuries of union with the Poles, Lithuania fell to the czar of Russia when Poland was dismembered by the three great Eastern powers of the time. There then followed a dark period in the history of the great Lithuanian people when they were so humiliated by suppression by the Russian Government that even the name of Lithuania was denied a place among the nations of the world.

National liberation came in the final year of World War I. Today, February 16, is the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of this proud nation. For 22 years, Lithuania was an independent nation which stood high in world esteem, even though these years were filled with threats and deprivations. Then, they fell once again under domination by a foreign power, this time that of the Soviets. Even so, the United States of America has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the free Republic of Lithuania.

This is the story of the Lithuanians—blood brothers with us in their love of freedom. These are a people whose glorious past and renaissance, under peculiarly moving conditions, are an earnest of great future achievement in all constructive activities. The American people, so devoted to the preservation of the ideals of liberty and freedom and human dignity, must become better acquainted with the story of Lithuania. We must understand better the contributions which a people, in spite of various and tremendous obstacles entirely beyond their control, have attempted to make and have made toward the advancement of civilization and the increase of happier relations among the members of that family of nations with which the Creator has blessed this world. I entreat all within this Chamber not to forget this republic that was first to fall to the Soviet Bolsheviks. The proud people of suffering Lithuania command our respect and support.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, today I join with the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian descent to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day.

For those of us who have lived our lives in freedom, it is difficult to imagine the hardships endured by the Lithuanian people in their valiant efforts to preserve their liberty and national independence. In commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, we hope to keep alive the determination of all who cherish freedom that Lithuania may once again become a free and independent nation.

The one encouraging aspect of this sad situation is that even under the most discouraging conditions, Lithuanians have not given up their love for freedom and their right to independence. On the anniversary of their independence we wish them forbearance and fortitude in their struggle against tyranny.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the nine Congresses of which I have been a Member, the plight of the valiant people of Lithuania has increasingly troubled me. For, though the cruel barbarisms of the Stalinist era may have given way to more subtle methods of rule, this long oppressed people still suffer under Communist domination. As a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I had an opportunity not long ago to observe closely the delegates from the Soviet Union, the country which ruthlessly stamped out Lithuania's independence in 1940. Neither in their words nor in their voting could I find evidence of humanitarian concern for people, or for freedom.

Not yet, Mr. Speaker, is there evidence in the whole realm of Soviet conduct of simple recognition of the right of people to choose their own form of government, to live their lives as they themselves determine. And yet, as surely as I know the sun must rise, I know the people of Lithuania will once again achieve the national independence they established 47 years ago. I am proud to join this tribute to them in the firm conviction that our own renewed resolve and dedication will help to hasten that day.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join with Lithuanians and freedom-loving people the world over in marking the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Few peoples have withstood more sustained efforts to eradicate their national identity than the Lithuanians.

Lithuania is a small Baltic nation which throughout the past has been surrounded by large, ambitious neighbors with little regard for the rights or frontiers of Lithuania. This country's history has been one of constant invasion and occupation by foreign powers, yet none of her conquerors has been able to extinguish the patriotism of Lithuanians. After 22 years of independence, Lithuania fell before the advance of an imperialistic foe. Soviet Russia incorporated Lithuania into the Soviet Union in 1940 and even the pretext of independence has vanished.

The Soviet rulers recognized the strength and tenacity of Lithuanian nationalism and took drastic steps to wipe out every vestige of Lithuanian culture, heritage, and religion. Under Stalin, attempts were made to eliminate all Baltic national minorities by massive deportation. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were uprooted from their homeland and sent to the wastes of Siberia. Thousands of Russians have moved into Lithuania in an obvious attempt to change once and for all its character and nationality. This is truly one of the great tragedies of our time.

That Stalinist Russia had to resort to terror and torture to implement its policy in Lithuania is an everlasting tribute to the bravery and fortitude of Lithuanian patriots. The soul of Lithuania will not die, because Lithuanians will not let it die. Tyranny and injustice will not prevail because brave men will not let them prevail. At this moment Lithuania is part of the Soviet Union not out of



choice, but because of an army of occupation and a history of rigged elections.

The day will come, Mr. Speaker, when Lithuanians will be freed from the yoke of foreign domination once and for all. We who are fortunate enough to live in the United States can do much to hasten the day when Lithuanians will be able to breathe the air of a free nation and live the lives of freemen.

We must continue to bring the subjugation and exploitation of Lithuania to the attention of all freedom-loving people. We must continue to be a source of truth and inspiration to the people of Lithuania through our radio broadcasts. Finally, we must not let the fate of Lithuania become the fate of any other nation. We must show by word and deed that America still stands for freedom and democracy and that tyranny and imperialism have no place in our world today.

Lithuanians have suffered much in their righteous cause, and suffer yet. Mr. Speaker, we pray for the day when her independence will be restored to her and when her people will be released from bondage.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Americans are today commemorating the 47th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. The people of Lithuania, under the harsh yoke of Soviet communism, cannot observe this independence day, but it is fitting that we in this country pause and salute a people whose courage and firm faith have survived great adversities. It is sad that another year must witness their desperate frustrations as they are denied the right of self-government.

Lithuania, one of the oldest and most respected nations in the history of the world, has a noble tradition of fine culture; they are an industrious people deserving far better than servitude to Moscow. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to A.D. 1200. Their freedom was lost in 1795 and not regained until 1918. From 1918 until 1940 Lithuania enjoyed freedom. In that short period of time Lithuania had a notable and respected place among the world of nations. Then in 1940 the Soviet Union discarded treaty obligations and invaded this small country and the two other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia. They were compelled to become a part of the Soviet Republic. In the years since, the people have endured oppression, slavery and exile. Lithuania is a victim of Russian greed, for there is no compatibility between the Lithuanian system of freedom developed between 1918 and 1940, and the Soviet dictatorial system of today.

Lithuanians have contributed so much to the culture and welfare of Europe, and Lithuanian-Americans have made great contributions to our country. Lithuanian-Americans are especially concerned over the tragic plight of their brethren in Lithuania. They remember with pride the glorious years of independence and they look forward to the founding of a new Lithuanian democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the sponsors of a resolution to provide for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, as a means of symbol-

izing to all our determination never to forget the captive nations, their sacrifices and struggles for freedom. I hope Congress will approve this resolution; it would be an effective way of putting Russia on notice that America is unalterably opposed to Communist colonization.

I am happy to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives to once again salute the courageous people of Lithuania and assure them of our friendship and offer them our encouragement. If this reaffirmation of our friendship for the Lithuanian people accomplishes nothing else, I hope it will signal anew America's rejection of tyranny in any form and our allegiance to government by self-determination, not meaningless existence under Communist tyranny.

It is the duty of freemen everywhere to maintain an unflagging interest in the fate of Lithuania and the other enslaved nations, and to persevere in the long struggle to achieve a world in which free people can live together in peace.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today is the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Throughout the Middle Ages, Lithuania was an embattled kingdom fighting for its freedom. Despite repeated invasion and occupation, Lithuania developed rich customs and a strong sense of national identity. That identity was acknowledged by the framers of the Versailles Treaty led by Woodrow Wilson. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania became an independent state. The League of Nations was commissioned to be the guarantor of national self-determination for a people so often oppressed by foreign powers.

Yet after only 22 years, Lithuania lost its cherished independence to the Soviet Union. Now, as has been the case for most of Lithuanian history, the country is occupied, ruled from abroad, and denied its freedom.

There are strong reasons why America should champion the cause of Lithuania. During the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, many Lithuanians sought the dream of American life and emigrated to this country. Their contribution to the United States was and continues to be substantial. And though all citizens of Lithuanian background are fully assimilated into our ways, their customs still thrive as a reminder of this country's rich immigrant legacy.

So it is with many other countries now behind the Iron Curtain. Our commitment to Lithuania may thus symbolize our refusal to accept an Eastern Europe in bondage. On this day celebrating Lithuanian independency, we should renew that commitment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I join today, the 47th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, with freedom-loving men everywhere in saluting the bravery and perseverance of the people of this tiny Baltic nation.

In the short period between 1918, when Lithuania declared her independence, and the start of World War II, when the Soviet Union reannexed the struggling nation by force, Lithuania successfully established a democratic and progressive

state and made impressive gains in every area of her national life. These years of growth and prosperity as a free state bore witness to the courage and resourcefulness of Lithuania's people, qualities testified to since by their determination to resist Soviet tyranny. The Lithuanian's refusal to submit to Soviet Russia's efforts at "Russification"—an attempt to absorb Lithuania totally into the Soviet Union by eradicating her national language and culture—strongly support this suffering nation's claim to national identity and independence.

We in the United States respect this claim and have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's incorporation of Lithuania. It is fitting today that we reaffirm our conviction that Lithuania must again enjoy the status of a sovereign state, and that her brave people again know the liberty and national independence they have so painfully suffered for and so well earned.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join most humbly with my colleagues in paying tribute to the spirit of freedom held in the hearts of Lithuanian people everywhere. This day marks the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania, a land still under the yoke of the Soviets.

The people of Lithuanian descent who now live in this greatest of free countries are marking this day with sadness in their hearts for their loved ones and friends who remain in Lithuania. Yet they rejoice at the thought that someday the Russian domination and subjugation of Lithuania will end; that once more this Baltic nation will know freedom.

As we rise to join in the salutes to the people of Lithuania, I would like to call attention to a letter I received from the Most Reverend V. J. Brizgys of Chicago. I believe it is very significant at this time.

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

Representative G. CUNNINGHAM,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has always been my great honor and pleasure to express at least a brief note of thanks, appreciation, and respect to those friends of Lithuania who, on February 16—the independence day of Lithuania—affirm their friendship and sympathy to the Lithuanian nation. Inasmuch as I shall not be in the United States on February 16 of this year, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation in advance to all who will remember Lithuania on her independence day.

I also would like to share with you the most recent news from Lithuania. The Russian occupation forces have not softened. Forcible Russification continues. Greater pressure upon teachers, officials, and judges, to be propagandists for godless atheism, is stressed. Those practicing their faith are constantly persecuted. Lithuanian youth is still being drafted for labor in Siberia. Including survivors of the first mass deportations, these new transportees comprise approximately 130,000 forcibly exiled from their homeland.

The cross which the Lithuanian nation and country is bearing is an onerous one. The nation does not stop yearning for freedom. In spirit it is wholeheartedly with the free world. It hopes that by its own efforts and the aid of its good friends it will realize freedom and justice in the near future. They have no desire to be a slave of Moscow, but

long to be a member of the family of free nations of the world.

In the name of the Lithuanian nation allow me to thank all of you who support its hopes and actively seek to bring them to reality.

Faithfully yours,

V. J. BRIZGYS.

In the past I have had the honor to introduce and sponsor legislation which would put this nation firmly on record as to our desires and for these captive nations. Today I am introducing a House concurrent resolution which spells out the history of the Communist invasion and occupation of the Baltic States.

There is a call for action by this Congress, a request that the President bring up the Baltic States question in the United Nations with the following actions as our goal:

First, withdrawal of Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls.

Second, return of all Baltic exiles from Siberian prisons, labor camps, or elsewhere.

Third, free elections under U.N. supervision.

I think these are minimum and reasonable objectives. Certainly they are ones that we as the leader of the free world should support.

There can be no peace, no peaceful coexistence with communism. Let us all pray that the people of Lithuania and all occupied nations will again be free.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, people of Lithuanian extraction from throughout central and southern Ohio are gathering today at Holy Cross Hall in Dayton, in observance of Republic of Lithuania Day. On this occasion I sent a greeting to the group and wish to commend it to my colleagues in the House:

GREETING TO THE FEDERATION OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN R.C. SOCIETIES ON THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY

As February 16 comes again it is a day mixed with solemn contemplation and joyful thanksgiving.

We are sorrowful, first, because we know this day marks the passing of a dream we once held possible. It marks the anniversary of the day you—as a proud people—could call your native land your own, where men could labor to build a lasting domicile for family and nation. These dreams are now only a memory fading with the passing of the ages.

But, secondly, it is also a day of joyful hope and thanksgiving. For it is on this day we honor the spirit of independence which, though brooding now like a sleeping giant, can reawaken and set men's hearts afire by the eternal truth that man once blessed with freedom, will tolerate no other way of life.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. This memorable anniversary has been observed year in and year out by the Lithuanian people, and by all Americans of Lithuanian descent. In this manner, they have kept a spark of hope burning in their hearts—the hope that the day will soon come when the independent Republic of Lithuania will once again assume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is only fitting that we, the Congress of the United States, pause for a moment in our deliberations and express our admiration for the staunch faith and undaunted courage of the Lithuanian people who have been suffering so greatly under the ruthless Soviet occupation, but who, in spite of this totalitarian oppression, have maintained their spirit and their devotion to the principles of freedom and democracy.

Let us, on this occasion, bolster their hopes in the eventual realization of their aspiration to resume their existence as an independent Republic. The conscience of the free world will not be at rest until liberty and justice shall reign over the lands which are today enveloped by the dark clouds of Communist totalitarianism. To this end, we shall continue to devote our efforts.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the first identity of what has been known as Lithuania can be traced to the 10th century, but it was not until about 1225 that the various tribes that roamed the countryside were united in what might be described as a state. From that time through the Middle Ages and into the 15th century, Lithuania was a proud country, inhabited by proud and peaceful people, and respected by other nations of Europe.

Because of a marriage in 1385 between Duke Jagello of Lithuania and Poland's Queen Jadwiga, and the resulting union of Lublin in 1569, the histories of Poland and Lithuania were immeasurably intertwined for more than three centuries, with final incorporation into czarist Russia at the end of the 18th century. The Lithuanians were never happy about their intimacy with Poland, but under czarist Russia their very existence and identity was at stake.

Freedom appeared on the horizon in 1917. While the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks were fighting in Russia, national Lithuanian groups throughout the world reminded each other independence was finally in sight. Finally on February 16, 1918 the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian nation proclaimed the freedom and independence of the country.

By 1920 German and Russian troops had left the country, and the industrious Lithuanian people set about the task of building a modern state. In 1939 war clouds cast a deep shadow over Europe, and under pressure of Russia, the little independent country signed a "mutual assistance pact" with the Soviets on October 10, 1939. On the face of it the pact seemed innocent enough. Among other things, the Soviets were granted land in Lithuania to establish airbases. Less than a year later, in June of 1940 while Germany was attacking France, the Russians occupied the countries of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia on the grounds that their national security was at stake.

About a month later, in July 1940, one of the most insidious events in Lithuanian history took place when the Russians held forced "elections." In true Communist fashion there was one ticket. In spite of the fact there was a penalty for not voting and that many Lithuanians posted blank ballots, the Soviets an-

nounced to the world that more than 99 percent of the people voted in the election. Indeed, the results of the election were announced in London by the Russians, 24 hours before the polls closed.

Within a week the new assembly met, and without ever taking a vote, the assembly requested in the name of the Lithuanian people to be incorporated into the U.S.S.R. The Supreme Soviet Council accepted the request and Lithuania became the 14th Republic in the U.S.S.R.

Almost a year to the day later, June 24, 1941, German soldiers drove the Russians out of the country, and thus Communist domination was replaced by Fascist domination. Lithuania was in ruins, and to make matters worse, the Germans refused every request of the Lithuanians to set up some kind of government to restore order. Instead, the Germans incorporated Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and White Ukraine under a Nazi civil administration which lasted 3 years.

With the spirit of freedom still alive in the hearts of the people, the resistance movement to Nazi control grew in great proportion.

The suppression by the Fascists was only the beginning, not the end, of national suffering, for in July 1944 the Russians pushed the Germans out of the country, and reestablished Communist control. The once peaceful country was in ruins and chaos. As the Russians entered the country 200,000 Lithuanians tried to leave their country. As the Germans pulled back they destroyed property, murdered Jews, executed prisoners, and 350,000 Lithuanians were either deported to Germany or fled to Germany to escape the Russians.

On July 13, 1944, the Russians proclaimed they had "liberated" the Lithuanian people, when in fact one master had been replaced by another. Lithuanians caught between the two masters were murdered.

Since that fateful summer in 1944 when the allies began to see a glimmer of victory in the war in Europe, the Lithuanians have been silenced.

But what of the future? Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the future of a free and independent Lithuania is not bright—never hopeless—but not bright. The United States has never recognized the farcical incorporation of this country into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Let us hope the Lithuanian people will face this burden until such day they will once again join the community of free nations.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, almost a half century has passed since the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Thus, we cannot forget that the Lithuanians, once a free people, are no longer free. Lithuanian-Americans observe proudly in their hearts the heritage of freedom. They will not, as we will not, discard both the heritage and the hope that Lithuania will be free before too many anniversaries have passed.

Let it not be said that we have forgotten. We shall nourish that hope and keep it green, fresh, and growing so that



hope becomes a promise and the promise a reality.

I join with all free men in admiration of the bravery of the Lithuanian people who have not abandoned their hope.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1965, is not a happy day for the people of Lithuania and for the Lithuanian-Americans living here.

On that day in 1918, after a century and a half of foreign rule, Lithuania became an independent nation. The National Council at Vilnius declared Lithuania to be a free and independent republic and created a provisional government to hold national elections. On this important day the rebirth of the Lithuanian nation occurred. The long years under the yoke of foreign oppressors had not diminished the Lithuanian love for freedom and independence.

A short time after the declaration of independence, troops from the Bolshevik government of Russia waited on the borders of Lithuania for the withdrawal of the Kaiser's armies. When the German troops left, the Red forces invaded the newly independent nation and forced the provisional government to move from Vilnius to Kaunas where a national army was organized. In a pitched battle the national army of Lithuania soundly defeated the Red forces. As a result of this defeat, the Soviet Government renounced sovereignty over Lithuania.

All the major powers recognized Lithuania as a free and independent nation. Democratic elections were held and distinguished leaders fervently guided the new nation in world affairs. Shortly thereafter, Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations where it was respected and where it exercised significant leadership.

From 1920 to 1940, economic and social progress was very noticeable. The land reform program gave land to thousands of families. New agricultural techniques provided the people with bumper crops. Sufficient food was produced to feed not only the people of the nation but enough left over for export.

Industrial plants grew like mushrooms. Transportation and communications systems were expanded. Social legislation brought health, education, and welfare benefits within the reach of everyone. This was the situation in Lithuania for two decades. Then the Nazi armies were on the move and World War II began.

Under the pretext of protection, the Soviet Union forced Lithuania to capitulate to the entry of thousands of troops into Lithuania, despite every attempt of cooperation made by the Lithuanians. Once the massive Russian Army was in Lithuania, no resistance was allowed and free elections were never again permitted. Lithuania became a victim to be exploited for the benefit of the Soviets; a pattern which has since become sadly familiar in many other countries.

All over the world, Lithuanians are gathering, at this time, to renew their vows to work for the independence of their homeland. I hope the day is not far away when Lithuania may be restored as a free and independent republic among the other nations of the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1965, is the 47th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It was on this day 47 years ago that the Lithuanian people, soon to be followed by the people of Estonia and Latvia, proclaimed their independence after more than a century of czarist rule. But after only 22 years of liberty, marked by great progress, they were again subjugated by Soviet tyranny. Lithuania was, in fact, the first victim of Stalin's infamous pact with Hitler that touched off World War II and ultimately resulted in the enslavement of all of Eastern Europe.

Today Lithuania, along with her Baltic neighbors Latvia and Estonia, are supposedly equal republics within the Soviet Union. Some time ago when the subjugation and sovietization of Lithuania were at their height, the following sentence appeared in an official Soviet publication: "Everything is new, everything is joyous and majestic. The country is continually moving forward. The Soviet system, the people's power, has brought happiness to every Lithuanian patriot." This is indeed a gross travesty of the truth. Lithuanian patriots were arrested, tortured, executed, and deported as communism was spread by force throughout their land. Lithuanians only wished to be left in peace to pursue their own independent course in the world, but they were, instead, subjected to the tyrannical control of international communism.

The history of Lithuania is one of continual invasion and occupation by foreign powers. It is an everlasting tribute to the strength and character of the Lithuanian people that through all these vicissitudes they have preserved and maintained a colorful and unique culture, history, and language. On February 16, 1918, when Lithuanians were finally able to assert their independence, they established a democratic form of government; and there was an immediate resurgence of national pride and a prompt expansion of her free institutions.

During the long periods of foreign domination the devout and dedicated people of Lithuania had persevered in their resistance to tyranny and faithfully preserved the heritage of faith and freedom. The history and tradition of Lithuanian independence is a living thing and a blessed thing. It has not been crushed in the past and it will not be crushed by the present Soviet regime, no matter what their tactics.

Our own country was founded on the principles of freedom and self-determination; and we cannot, with a clear conscience, turn our backs on the plight of the enslaved people of Lithuania. Appreciating our own blessings as citizens of the United States we should not permit a day to pass without thinking and planning and praying for the time when Lithuania will be freed from Communist tyranny. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to take part in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that we should today join the Lithuanian-Americans in their observance of the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania and I want to commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving this special hour in the House.

The people of Lithuania have a noble heritage and their struggle for freedom has furnished hope and inspiration to the democratic aspirations of many small nations. That is why we should particularly remember, as we pay tribute to the gallant spirit of free Lithuania and the noble heritage of our citizens of Lithuanian descent who have done so much in helping to make this country great, that cruel fate has afflicted the Lithuanian nation with the yoke of tyranny and oppression.

This oppression encompasses many formerly free lands and many noble peoples. On this day commemorating Lithuanian independence, let us not forget these and other victims from other once free nations who suffer from aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny.

Instead, in hailing the contributions and sacrifices of the Lithuanian people, let Americans everywhere pledge their belief and determination to fight for international order, honor, and decency. Let it also be known on this day of Lithuanian independence that the American Congress, reflecting the wishes and sentiments of the American people, reaffirms principles of liberty, justice, freedom, human honor, and decency.

As I have stated many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, there can be no lasting peace so long as Red imperialism continues to hold men in bondage in denial of their God-given rights. If we and the rest of the free world continue our efforts for peace and freedom, the day will come when Lithuania and all other subject nations may rejoice in the blessings of freedom and governments of their

The time has come for this Nation to stand firm and resolute. On this great day of Lithuanian independence let us serve notice to the Soviet and the people of the world just where we stand on the great issues of freedom, honor, decency, and peace and in acknowledging the great contributions of our citizens of Lithuanian origin, let us send to the afflicted Lithuanian people the strong assurance that their friends in America will remain with them in their adversities and that the Congress of the United States extends the hand of friendship and the warm, sincere pledge of devoted helpfulness to their great cause of human liberty.

In so doing, Mr. Speaker, this Nation will be serving notice to the whole world that we stand firm and resolute on the adoption of an affirmative policy to discharge in full measure our obligation to stand by and sustain the Lithuanian people and oppressed peoples everywhere in their hopes for liberation and deliverance from tyranny.

Long live free Lithuania. May that great land and inspired peoples soon regain the great liberties they cherish.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to pay tribute to the brave Lithuanian people on the significant occasion of the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. This week also marks the 714th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State and the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Kingdom when



Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first King of the Lithuanian Empire.

As these two latter events indicate, the Lithuanians form one of the oldest ethnic groups in northeastern Europe. Their known history goes back to at least 1,000 years in their homeland on the eastern shore of the Baltic. There they have lived during all that time; during most of the millennium they have had to struggle for the maintenance of their freedom and independence.

At one time during the late Middle Ages their kingdom was one of the most powerful states in all eastern Europe. Late in the 14th century the Lithuanian king married Poland's reigning queen and thus came into being the union of the two kingdoms. As a junior partner in this union, Lithuania was not always satisfied, but nevertheless remained faithful to the union. Late in the 18th century when czarist Russia annexed most of Poland, Lithuania went with it and became part of the Russian empire. For more than 120 years these helpless souls had no choice but to bear the oppressive yoke of the czars. Alone they were unable to free themselves, and in the absence of effective aid from other quarters, they put up with all the suffering that was their unhappy lot.

At the end of the First World War the czarist Russian regime was no more and the Russian empire was broken up. Then the Lithuanians saw their real chance to free themselves. As a matter of fact, even before the end of that war, on February 16, 1918, they had proclaimed their independence and had established their own government. This important event proved a turning point in the modern history of Lithuania, and seemed to usher in a new and happy era. From then on for a little more than two decades, Lithuanians worked feverishly to make their ruined and ravaged country a safe haven for themselves. Considering the relatively short time they had, they did remarkably well. In due time Lithuania became a respected member of the world community of free and sovereign states. But this happy interlude of independence did not last beyond the second decade of the interwar years, and soon after the outbreak of the last war in 1939 Lithuania's freedom became a casualty of that war.

In the fall of 1939 the Lithuanian Government was compelled by the Soviet Union to sign a mutual assistance pact; then early in 1940 Lithuania was attacked by the Red army and occupied. And finally in July of 1940 the country was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then, unhappy Lithuanians have been denied freedom in their homeland. They have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny and unfortunately there seem to be no signs of easing Communist rule over Lithuania. Fortunately, however, these stouthearted people have not given up hope for their freedom, and on the 47th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope that they will attain their goal in freedom.

I am pleased to sponsor in this Congress, as I did in the 88th Congress, a resolution expressing the sense of Con-

gress that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States. I urge our colleagues to support this legislation and help to keep alive the gallant spirit of the Lithuanian people. The text of House Concurrent Resolution 68 follows:

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives created by H. Res. 346 of the Eighty-third Congress, to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former Governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets—

(1) To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) To return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared itself independent. This was a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination—1795–1915—followed by German occupation during the First World War.

Few nations strove harder or waited longer for independence than did Lithuania. For over two decades Lithuania prospered and grew under its newly won independence. Then in the summer of 1940, the Soviets demanded immediate formation of a "friendly" government and occupied the country. A rigged election was held to produce a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, at this "request," Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. Since that fateful day, Lithuania has seen her land exploited, her people executed and

deported, and her independence ground under the heel of Communist terror.

The resistance of the Lithuanians to this Soviet aggression has been nothing short of heroic. This courageous nation has had a long history of fighting off aggressors, and it is this tradition which has been one of the underlying strengths of the resistance to Soviet tyranny. Lithuania has been known to history since 1009, when it was a nation divided into many principalities. Threats from abroad were an important factor in bringing the principalities together into a united state. By the 14th century the boundaries of Lithuania extended into what is now the Byelorussian S.S.R. and the Russian S.F.S.R. In the year 1387, Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state.

One scholar, Clarence Manning, has described Lithuania's role in the Middle Ages as follows:

The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the East for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and Tartars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has a culture, a language, and a heritage that any nation would be proud to claim as its own. It is wrong, terribly wrong, that these people are not allowed to follow their own independent path in life. To judge from the past, however, it is evident that the spirit of courage and liberty which strongly inspires Lithuanians was not broken in the 120 years of Russian occupation; it has not been broken by the present Communist regime; and it will not be broken in the future. On this 47th anniversary of their independence, we congratulate Lithuanians on their glorious history as a nation—and offer our sincere hope that Lithuania will again take her rightful place in the ranks of the sovereign states of the world.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues here in commemorating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

For the unfortunate time being there is no longer, in Lithuania, any of the four freedoms, the freedoms for which the democracies of the world struggled so long and so patiently during the last war and for which their thousands of heroes died or became disabled.

Although we mourn over her present plight there is no cause for surrendering to despair. Repeatedly, through her history, Lithuania has demonstrated that her people can eventually overcome the temporary triumph of any oppressor.

The Christian faith, which, in 1399, defeated the Tartar invasion and saved all Europe from barbarism, is still with her today. It gives her the spiritual vigor to outlive any dictatorship. Deep in the heart of every Lithuanian there is an everlasting passion for liberty and freedom which never dies.



Lithuania lives. Lithuania lives in the hearts of her sons and daughters who have survived brutal persecution. Lithuania lives in the hearts of liberty-loving folk the world over. Lithuania lives in her great literature, her splendid history and great traditions, her songs and dances, the deep religious faith of her people, and in their burning devotion to the land of their ancestry.

Lithuania will not perish as long as ideals of freedom and justice and righteousness prevail. Lithuania cannot be destroyed by perfidy and brutality and tyranny.

There will always be a Lithuania—a Lithuania in the hearts of men, a Lithuania in the culture of the peoples, a Lithuania in the history of the world's struggle for freedom, and in due time a Lithuania at the conference table of the world's great family of nations.

For cruel enslavement of a people as devoted to freedom as the Lithuanians, as true to their faith as they, as implacable in their will to escape tyranny as they, is finally impossible. Even so bestial a despotism as Russia will fall of its own evil ways, its dependence upon force and injustice for its power and rule. "The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small" and however coarse and base the grist, the meal will be justice and truth and honor.

When all the terrible tyranny of her alien conquerors has been exhausted Lithuania will survive and Lithuania will still be living for there is no power that can forever enslave a people who are determined to be free.

Let us then renew our pledges to perseveringly work for the freedom of Lithuania and let us unite in our prayers that the Almighty will see fit to speed that freedom day.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is again time for us in the free world to pay tribute to the independence movement of the Lithuanian people. Forty-seven years ago a proud and independent Lithuania gained freedom from foreign domination when her larger neighbors collapsed in World War I.

The Lithuanians' natural desire for a sense of national identity and independence had never died in the more than 400-year period that the tiny nation had been absorbed, first by Poland, then by Russia.

Enlightened Lithuanian leaders established a progressive constitutional democracy. But the new state could not avoid the great power ambitions that kept Europe in a constant state of turmoil during the period between the two wars. The seeds of democracy fell into troubled soil.

The czarist grip that had been broken in 1917 was only to be replaced 23 years later by a far more potent form of tyranny. The Communists, true to their hatred of independence, absorbed Lithuania into the Soviet Union after making a cynical pact with the Nazis. Next followed a period of Nazi tyranny, followed again by Soviet oppression.

Those of us who enjoy the freedom to pursue our own national independence realize that the spirit of liberty will never disappear among the Lithuanian people. We share their hopes and dreams as the

world moves inexorably toward tolerance and diversity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable tribute to the indomitability of the human spirit that more than seven centuries of history have not stilled the cry for independence and freedom by the Lithuanian people.

Today we commemorate the 714th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state, the 712th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom, and the 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918.

These have not been 700 peaceful and happy years. They have been years of torment, turmoil, and trouble for the Lithuanian people. Yet, despite the hardship, these people have stood fast in their defense of freedom.

We all know of the outstanding contributions that have been made to our culture and society by people of Lithuanian ancestry. Today we join with them in commemorating these historic events and express once more our hope that the people of Lithuania will again one day live in peace and justice.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a most appropriate time for us to be reminded that freedom can never be taken for granted. It is something to be guarded and protected and promoted throughout the world. For our own freedom would not long survive in a world enslaved.

The tiny nation of Lithuania was absorbed into the Soviet Union at the point of a bayonet. All that they had accomplished during their brief period of independence was lost. No longer were they to enjoy the fruits of their own labor. No longer could they elect the people they desired to lead them. No longer did they have the opportunity to develop a society upon the native talents and aspirations of their own kind.

During the Middle Ages Lithuania was strong and independent. She played an important part in the development of European civilization. Her people benefited from a progressive educational system. They enjoyed more personal liberties than peoples in neighboring states. It is tragic that they were not permitted to develop in freedom.

What a contrast to our own birth as a Nation. In 1795 our own infant Nation had an entire continent to explore, settle, and develop. There was no great power at our border waiting to take advantage of any weakness.

In 1795 Lithuania's long period of freedom in association with Poland was brutally ended when Poland was carved up among three greedy neighbors, with Lithuania falling under the domination of czarist Russia.

Russia held sway until forced out by the Germans in 1915. When the new Communist regime in Moscow attempted to regain control of Lithuania they were driven out by Lithuanian and Polish forces. The gallant little nation had withstood the first test of its newly won independence.

But Europe was in turmoil between the two World Wars and Lithuania's neighbors, though defeated in the war,

were determined to swallow any nation too small to resist. Soviet Russia, with the agreement of Nazi Germany, incorporated Lithuania into its own totalitarian regime.

This sad history of oppression has not quenched the desire for freedom and national self-determination of the Lithuanian people. We salute them on the 47th anniversary of their independence and dedicate ourselves again to the promotion of freedom for all peoples of the world.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to raise the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations in an effort to obtain early liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation.

Unfortunately, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to whom the resolution was referred for consideration, never took any action on it. I am now reintroducing it in the hope that we may be able to get action on this measure.

Two more years have passed since then, and now we are observing the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this day we join with the nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating the restoration of Lithuania's national independence 47 years ago and to pray for its early liberation from Communist oppression.

Lithuania's history dates back over a period of more than 700 years. Although a small state, it has made lasting contributions to Western culture and civilization over the centuries. On February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was established and it lasted as a free and sovereign state until June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union seized the country of more than 3 million people by force of arms and has subjugated it ever since.

During the past quarter of a century the people of Lithuania have been subject to a continuous Soviet reign of terror, ruthless exploitation, destruction of Lithuanian institutions and culture, persecution of religion, and forced exile to Siberia for many Lithuanians. If any free nation of the Western World or any so-called neutralist nation flirting with communism really wishes to know what happens to a people which has the misfortune to fall under the yoke of Communist imperialism, they have but to look at Lithuania. Here is one of the oldest nations in Europe which is gradually being ground to destruction by a power which cannot tolerate small nations and their cultures.

My resolution proposes that the United Nations make the following four requests of the Soviet Union:

First. Withdraw all Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Second. Return all Baltic exiles from Siberian and other slave-labor camps.

Third. Permit the United Nations to conduct free elections in the three Baltic States.

Fourth. Punish those guilty of crimes against the Baltic peoples.

The situation has not changed in the last 2 years and these four requests are still timely and urgent, if the Baltic peoples are to be saved from total annihilation. It is for this reason that I am reintroducing my resolution and urging the committee to schedule early hearings so that the matter can be given wide public attention.

On this day of observance of Lithuania's independence, which has become a sad day in the history of the Lithuanian people, I extend my sincere wishes to all Lithuanian-Americans for the early redemption of their ancestral homeland from Communist domination. We urge them to maintain utmost courage and hope for the future, and may they live to see a free and prosperous Lithuanian people restored on its ancient soil in our lifetime.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, two indisputable facts ought to be clearly borne in mind. In the first place, we must never forget that Lithuania was once a free and independent nation-state; and, secondly, that Lithuania has been the victim of brutal Communist aggression.

From 1918 to 1940 Lithuania enjoyed the international status of an independent nation-state; world powers, great and small, recognized Lithuania and carried on normal diplomatic relations with her. Lithuanian statesmen, actively participating in international relations, concluded diplomatic engagements with many nations of the world. Lithuania, moreover, played a part of some importance in advancing the cause of world peace by its work as a member of the League of Nations and as a member of other international organizations devoted to the purposes of peace.

On the domestic scene, Lithuanians built a strong and vigorous economic and social order. In cultural achievements they made many significant advances; and in the religious realm, all Lithuanians were free to seek in their own way their religious destiny.

However, Lithuanian independence came to an end in June 1940, when the Soviet Union dispatched its army across the borders, occupied the country, and annexed it to the U.S.S.R. That the Soviet Union was guilty of aggression is unquestioned. By their unwarranted and brutal military invasion, the Soviets had willfully destroyed every contractual engagement concluded between the U.S.S.R. and Lithuania. It is significant to note that in all of these political engagements, the Soviet Union acknowledged and reaffirmed the national independence and territorial integrity of Lithuania. With utter disregard of their pledged word, the Soviets destroyed the Lithuanian Republic.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the free world is reminded once again of the great misfortune that has befallen these people. This anniversary should be a reminder to all free peoples of Communist treachery, especially now when observers generally hold that a detente has been established in Soviet-American relations.

To Lithuanians everywhere, America extends its warmest felicitations, and

along with other nations of the free world, expresses the hope that the Communist tyranny they now endure will, in the course of time, dissolve, and the spirit of Lithuania once again be free.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting and proper for democracy's great representative body, the U.S. House of Representatives, to recall the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I say fitting and proper for this body, because to millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain, freedom and democracy are often synonymous with the American House of Representatives.

I realize that all our words, tributes, and remembrances will not undo the generations of suffering of the Lithuanian people, and I further realize that our words today will not give the Soviets, the present masters of Lithuania, a change of heart. The value of our comments today is that of recognition and hope.

We recognize first of all that Lithuania is not free. These people have not forgotten, and neither should we forget. The priceless freedom we have, and take for granted, in this country is made more dear when we recall the history of Lithuania. For centuries the Lithuanian people were under czarist domination. When Russia was split by the Communist revolution and civil war in 1917, the sovereign Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia saw their chance for freedom, and on February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared itself a republic based on democratic institutions.

The people of this valiant little country set about the task of governing themselves and restoring their country to the high state of international prestige they once enjoyed. When the war clouds spread over Europe in 1939 and 1940, Lithuania's powerful neighbor, who has never been known for respecting human rights and democratic institutions, moved in and occupied the country. For 3 years during World War II Lithuania was occupied not by Communist masters, but by Fascist masters. After the war Russia again occupied the country, and announced to the world they had "liberated" the Lithuanians from the Germans.

The United States formally recognized the new nation of Lithuania on July 27, 1922, and I am proud to say, has never given any recognition to the incorporation of that land into the U.S.S.R. Lithuania has never accepted such forcible annexation with the Soviet Union, and the love of liberty has not been smothered by the cruel tactics of the Communists. The plight of that little country is tragic indeed and we sympathize with her. We shall never forget the destruction of human life, the genocide, that was perpetrated upon the Lithuanians by the atheistic Communists and Fascists.

We Americans know and understand the stouthearted Lithuanians. We all appreciate their good character, their love of God, their industry, and their special talents, because so many of them live in America where they have made a very substantial contribution to our country and its culture and have become

good citizens of their adopted country. They are worthy of our admiration and esteem.

It is appropriate that we remember the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. By doing so we give expression to our compassion for our fellow human beings and at the same time help to keep the fires burning for idealism of democracy and freedom in Lithuania and in the world.

I join my colleagues in our fervent wish that, though the skies of Lithuania be now dark, the light of freedom will in the not-too-distant future break through and the sun will shine upon that nation and that these sturdy Baltic people will regain their rightful status as a member of the community of free nations.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the battlefronts of freedom are many. In recent months and weeks we have been giving our anxious attention to the situation in South Vietnam. Since 1948, we have stood firm in the defense of West Berlin and its residents. Between 1950 and 1953, the blood of our young men was shed in Korea, and we continue to man defenses in South Korea today. During the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, we repelled an ominous threat to this hemisphere; our policies continue to reflect our implacable hostility toward the subversive Castro regime. For years we have shared our resources with the less fortunate nations of the world in order to help them achieve economic well-being and political stability. Our young people, through the Peace Corps, are sharing their skills and ideals in many foreign lands.

Today, we pause to remember another battlefront of freedom—the small land of Lithuania. Our occasion is the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence—an anniversary that cannot be observed openly and with rejoicing in Lithuania today. For an independent and free Lithuania does not exist today. Lithuania has been forcibly made a part of the Soviet Union. The yoke of imperial Russia was thrown off in 1918 only to be replaced a little more than 20 years later by the more fearful yoke of an empire-hungry Soviet regime. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been executed, deported, exiled, and imprisoned. Their only crime was to value the ideals and freedom of their native land. The land of Lithuanians has been subjected to forced collectivization. Their church and their cultural institutions have been trampled upon. Their coast and cities have been invaded by Soviet soldiers and the merchants of economic exploitation.

We learn, however, from the few Westerners who have managed to visit Lithuania that the Lithuanians have not forgotten their former freedom. Their spirit is unconquered. Their hate for the foreign occupier is unyielding. This is why I say that Lithuania is one of the battlefronts of freedom today. We must not forget that their hopes and our hopes are closely linked. The moments we have set aside to observe Lithuanian Independence Day are meaningful for Lithuanians living behind the Iron Curtain and for Americans of



Lithuanian descent; they are meaningful for all Americans.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this day provides us with a most appropriate occasion to pay well-deserved tribute to the people of Lithuania for their unflinching attachment to freedom. The goal of national independence was won by the people of Lithuania 47 years ago today. They employed that era of personal liberty and national independence to regain for ancient Lithuania its full place in the family of nations. During that happy period relations between Lithuania and the United States prospered and grew into a lasting bond of friendship.

But the national independence of our proven and cherished friend, Lithuania, was shattered by the armed forces of Imperial Soviet Russia in the early days of World War II. We are reminded that the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939, which united communism and nazism in common purpose, was the evil instrument which brought an end to Lithuanian national independence. Nor can we forget that the only remaining partner to that international conspiracy, Soviet Russia, now threatens the independence of all sovereign nations.

We observe this day in the House of Representatives as a deliberate means of restating our support for Lithuanian national independence. As a nation we have not recognized the illegal annexation of Lithuania by imperial Russia. I trust we shall never excuse or recognize that act of infamy. Our position should remain as it is today—staunch defenders of the right of the people of Lithuania to their national independence. Remaining firm in that position we shall see the day when independence is restored to an ancient, honored, and peaceful nation.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, affords us an important opportunity to reflect upon the purpose of this annual occasion. By commemorating this anniversary, we are honoring not only our fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent but all Americans, regardless of their national heritage, who share the same love of freedom and liberty which has moved Lithuanians everywhere to see their homeland free again.

Freedom is not an accidental quality, to be awarded or withdrawn arbitrarily or capriciously. It belongs, by the very nature with which Almighty God has endowed mankind, to every individual human being. Governments are required by the moral law to respect this freedom and to rule their countries in such a way as to give full scope to the growth and development, in freedom, of the capacities and talents of their people. Governments which deny freedom and which subject their people to the burdens of tyranny violate the law of God and invite the condemnation of the free world.

Freedom has another characteristic, Mr. Speaker. It flourishes only where those who enjoy it take it seriously and strive to protect it and strengthen it and extend its benefits to others. It withers and dies where it is taken for granted, where apathy and disinterest reign,

where it is used and exploited only to serve a selfish purpose.

In Lithuania, however, freedom did not wither away. It was stolen. Lithuanians were deprived of their freedom by force of arms. And that condition has been perpetuated by a foreign-supported despotism in gross violation of international law and of the God-given rights of man.

Lithuanians, nevertheless, have not capitulated to tyranny. They have not surrendered. At great sacrifice, they have continued to resist oppression. And in their determination to be free again, to establish once more an independent, truly Lithuanian Government, they have the wholehearted support of their fellow Lithuanians in America and of all Americans who cherish our Nation's heritage.

In proportion to population, Mr. Speaker, few if any, of the countries of the world have contributed so importantly to the growth and development and strength of the United States as has this small Baltic State.

As one who represents a congressional district which includes among its residents a substantial number of people of Lithuanian ancestry, I speak from personal knowledge that Union County, N.J., is a better place in which to live because of their presence as our neighbors and fellow citizens.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we shall not abandon Lithuania, nor forget her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. We who represent our people in the Congress of the United States are proud to rededicate ourselves to the noble objective of the independence of the Baltic States and the freedom of people everywhere.

As a part of my remarks on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the text of resolutions adopted unanimously by members of the Lithuanian American Council of Linden, N.J., on February 7, 1965.

The resolution follows:

Whereas 47 years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania enjoyed an independent existence until occupied by the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, and to this day the country and its people are suffering under the tyrannical yoke of communism; and

Whereas contrary to the false pretense of standing for complete freedom and independence of all nations, demanding an end to all forms of colonialism—the Soviet Union continues to occupy and rule Lithuania and other captive European nations; and

Whereas the Americans of Lithuanian descent hope that Lithuania will again regain the rights of freedom and liberty as a sovereign nation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That all Americans of Lithuanian descent are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their independence and freedom; and

*Resolved*, That it is our hope that the representatives of our Government will firmly continue to maintain the policy of non-recognition of the incorporation by force of Lithuania in the Soviet Union; and

*Resolved*, That in advancement of the program for world peace and freedom special emphasis be laid upon the necessity to hasten

the liberation of the captive people of the Baltic States; and further be it

*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE and the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,

*President.*

STASYS VAICIUNAS,

*Secretary.*

MARGARITA SAMATAS,

*Chairman of Resolutions Committee.*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives today in reaffirming our resolution urging the freedom of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

These gallant nations have endured the yoke of communism for too long. They deserve the right to self-determination and to personal liberty for their citizens. Our recognition of their condition gives notice before the world that America rejects and repudiates Soviet imperialism wherever it is manifested.

Mr. Voldemars Korsts, special assistant to the President of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, recently sent me a memorandum defining in precise and unequivocal terms the present plight of the Baltic States. Mr. Korsts and this distinguished committee urge the United States to seek a redress of these grievances before the United Nations.

I have joined with many of my distinguished colleagues in introducing a concurrent resolution to request the President to ask that this entire question be brought before the United Nations. It is my hope this resolution will be acted upon favorably by the House and Senate in the near future. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all the countries now forced to live under Communist domination deserve to have their case presented in the open forum of the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Korsts stirring memorandum follows:

THE BALTIC STATES—ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA—HAVE A RIGHT TO BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

World War II brought an end to fascism, which preached superiority of some nations and races, and at the same time enslaved others. A United Nations doctrine was then brought to life; it promised liberty and freedom to all nations. The United Nations, however, made the mistake of not following it up. The Communists were allowed a free hand, resulting in the loss of many free nations behind the Iron Curtain. Thus did the Soviet Union—and, later, China—become colonial powers.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were the first victims of communism during World War II. Those three Baltic nations have inhabited the Baltic region for thousands of years. They had rejoiced in their freedom and independence, and were democratic and peace-loving peoples, with an old and valuable cultural heritage all their own.

In June of 1940 they were invaded and occupied by Soviet armed forces. Duly elected and popular governments were deprived of

their constitutional rights and the leaders of democratic forces arrested and often summarily executed. Moscow-appointed emissaries set up puppet governments, which carried out any and all orders from above. What followed then was a shocking line of Communist secret police terror, and the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets in 1941. The fact that in June of that year more than 200,000 persons—out of less than 6 million—were deported to slave labor camps is well known, as are the many postwar deportations. Since then other nationals have been settled in the Baltic region, with the clear goal of erasing the original inhabitants from history.

Living under heavy terror, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been robbed of the usual constitutional rights: the freedom of speech, assembly, and the practicing of religion. Even when conditions improve temporarily in Russia, they do not change in the Baltic States. Practically, they are enslaved. Despite all this, their desire for freedom has not been crushed. They are waiting silently and grimly for the promises of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter to be fulfilled. They are desperate, because they know that, unless help is coming they will be scattered and destroyed.

We must help the Baltic peoples rid themselves of the Communist regimes in their countries.

The outright annexations of the territories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union should be openly discussed and a demand should be made for the prompt reestablishing of their rights. The people of these countries are as fully entitled to their rights of self-determination as are the peoples of Africa, Asia, and the Americas: if some colonies are freed, why not all?

The Government of the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Every President since 1940 has reaffirmed this; yet, at the same time we must recognize that very little has been done to liberate the Baltic peoples. What we are talking about here is not a question of the right of self-rule of these nations, since this has been established beyond any doubt. The question is rather one of a practicable method for restoring their independence. The select committee of the House of Representatives (89d Cong.) to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, after holding 50 public hearings, during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations. The committee stated that our moves should be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, the committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with the enslaved nations are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that the Communist danger should be abolished and stopped during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to the committee, lies in a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world."

To this we might add that such an approach would prevent a Communist takeover of more and more nations with an ultimate danger of the same fate to this country.

The work of the committee has been recognized and many concurrent resolutions, calling for freedom for the captive peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, have been presented to the Senate and the House. Such resolutions have requested the President of the United States to bring the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations, to ask a ruling for:

1. The withdrawal of all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and control from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

2. The return of all Baltic exiles from Siberia and other parts of the Soviet Union, where they have been deported by force or by the so-called voluntary work assignments.

3. The conduct of free elections in the three countries, under direct supervision of the United Nations.

Let us show the courage to call the Communists to order, since theirs are the only real colonial empires left.

Today and not tomorrow is the time to do this. The suffering and subjugation of any nation must spur us to action. By maintaining the rights of others to be free, we confirm our own unyielding will to survive in freedom and in peace.

Therefore we urge you to act for the course of freedom and introduce and support such resolutions. The United Nations Charter provides the legal framework; the history and the heritage of the United States provides the courage and incentive; the brutally enslaved Baltic nations provide the reason for such action. The passage of resolutions calling for the restoration of independence of the Baltic States would be an important step not only for the freedom of these victims of communism, but a ray of hope for all captive peoples and a foundation for lasting peace with justice and honor.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, few nations of the world have been forced to live longer under the heels of tyrants than Lithuania. For more than a century, her people were suppressed by the czars of Russia.

When Lithuania was finally freed on February 16, 1918, her people proved that they could achieve far more in the way of human progress in a short space of time than any comparable small nation the world has known.

Even in the tragically brief span of 22 years, the Lithuanian people were able to establish a growing economy, build a sound education system, and provide hitherto unknown opportunities for themselves and their neighbors.

Lithuania set an example for the free world. But when the Soviet Union sent its forces into the country in 1940, under the guise of protecting it from Nazi Germany, the struggle for a genuinely democratic society was brought to an end.

The Soviet Union asked the world to believe, then, that its occupation was only temporary. That, as the world has seen, was a lie.

Today, as it has for the past quarter of a century, Lithuania lives with the yoke of an alien government about her neck. Her people, whose spirit had flourished in freedom, have proved time and time again that their thirst for liberty is undiminished.

The United States has very prudently withheld recognition of the Soviet takeover of Lithuania. This country and all its people join freemen everywhere in the fervent prayer that one day liberty will be restored to the proud land of Lithuania.

I consider it a high honor to join with my distinguished colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, Congressman Flood, in paying tribute to this tragically suppressed small nation and its people.

Here in America we have been fortunate in having many Lithuanians as naturalized citizens. They have come here, not merely to escape tyranny and dictatorship, but to contribute their own vitality and spirit and skills to the building of this great Nation.

I am proud of the contributions Americans of Lithuanian ancestry have made to my own district and I join with them in commemorating the independence of the land their fathers once called their own.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honor and a grave responsibility to join my colleagues today in observing the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day.

As freemen, and as Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, we can speak out and we must speak out on the tragedy which has, for so long, pressed down on the peoples of Lithuania.

In a world where the fate of small nations is often decided by forces over which they have no control, Lithuania is a prime example of how a small, independent nation can be crushed by tyranny. More than once, in the course of its history, Lithuania has been occupied by foreign tyrants. This history began in A.D. 1009, nearly 500 years before the discovery of America. One must hope that a people of such character and sustenance, a people who in their 22 years of freedom during this century adopted a democratic form of government, must in the end prevail.

The late Winston Churchill once wrote:

Laws, just or unjust, may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery of propaganda may pack their minds with falsehoods. But the soul of man thus held in trance, or frozen in a long night, can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where. People in bondage need not despair.

By paying tribute to Lithuania today, we are sustained by its history and its many achievements. And we help sustain the people of Lithuania in their hopes for ultimate deliverance.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th of February it has become customary in this House of Representatives to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania and to their nation that had on this day won its independence.

It is fitting that we should commemorate this occasion, because we Americans should never become so taken up with the busy affairs of our national and international life that we cannot take at least a moment to pay our respects to a heroic people. In so doing we keep alive the idea that Lithuania was an independent country and that it was a victim of Soviet treachery. But we also keep alive within our own national tradition the supreme ideal of our commitment to self-determination for all peoples.

During the interwar period Lithuania had been an established, viable nation-state. Diplomatic relations had been established with other nations of the world, and in the League of Nations, Lithuania had done her part in maintaining world peace. In internal matters the Lithuanians had created a vigorous economic order. The social aspects of Lithuanian life were commendable, and culturally the nation flourished. And, of course, politically the Lithuanians charted their own destiny as they saw fit.

The point to make here is simply this: Lithuanians had proved their capacity to



rule their own nation; they had won the respect and admiration of the world; they had a right to be proud of their achievements as a nation. This being true, what rationalization can there be for the Soviet conquest other than its compulsive drive to expand the borders of communism. This is a thought we must all bear in mind during these days of so-called peaceful coexistence.

To the Lithuanian people here in the United States, in Western Europe, and in their own homeland, I, therefore, extend my warmest congratulations on this their day of national commemoration. May they be given the inner strength to bear their oppression manfully, and let me say that we all look forward to that day when the principle of self-determination will be a respected universal principle for all mankind.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Independence Day is the most significant Lithuanian national holiday. It symbolizes the culmination of their long and ceaseless struggle, often against forbidding odds, for their national goal. Its annual celebration signifies that, even though more than two decades ago Lithuanians lost their independence and have been living under the worst of tyrannies, they still cling to their ideals, freedom, and independence. Naturally, one of the best and perhaps the most effective way to keep the spirit of freedom alive among the Lithuanians is by observing and celebrating their independence day.

On February 16, 1918, as the Lithuanian people asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence, they saw the dawn of a new, brighter, and better day for them; in their freedom a new era of peace and joy was ushered in for them in their homeland. And they felt that it was up to them to make the very best of the opportunity thus offered to them, proving to their friends that they were worthy of the reward, of their national independence. Today the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day evokes memories of joy and happiness, of peace and prosperity that was the lot of Lithuania during the interwar years, until all that was ruined and they were robbed of their freedom by the greedy men in the Kremlin. On the observance of the anniversary of that historic event we are fully aware that for more than two decades Lithuanians have not known freedom. But we are heartened by the fact that they fervently cherish and nurse their love for freedom and independence.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, during this crucial period when the free world is engaged in a supreme effort to prevent the spread of world communism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, we often tend to forget those courageous peoples in parts of Europe who have lost this struggle and have succumbed to the forces of oppression and tyranny.

Included in this assemblage of conquered nations are the gallant Lithuanians who celebrated their 47th anniversary of independence on February 16.

This independence was unfortunately short lived, lasting only 22 years.

The independent Lithuania was created as a sovereign state at the termination of the first world holocaust of this century and was crushed at the beginning of the second major world conflict.

The stoic Lithuanians, however, were not defeated in spirit nor in their resolve to regain their independence. For over 125 years prior to their initial independence, they had suffered almost virtual slavery at the hands of several European powers but their desire, during this time, for freedom continuously prevailed. On June 23, 1941, these courageous people staged a revolution and declared themselves sovereign. They were, however, ignored and were occupied by the Nazis for 2 years until in the summer of 1944, they were once again occupied by Soviet troops and oppression. The Soviet powers then attempted a semblance of legitimacy by their typical ruse in proclaiming Lithuania to be a component republic of the Soviet Union.

The free world, however, can easily see through this sham and is fully cognizant of the deep and continuing desire of the Lithuanians to once again become a free and sovereign state and to take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians only desire to live in peace and freedom and to pursue, once again, the process of nation-building that was so ruthlessly suppressed. These are industrious and hard working people who, if given the opportunity, could build a strong and prosperous nation.

Thus, as I am honored to join with other Americans and all freedom loving people in celebrating the independence of Lithuania. Let us reaffirm our determination to work for that day when the Lithuanians, as well as all enslaved peoples in the other Baltic and Eastern European states, may throw off the yoke of tyranny and once again live as free men and women, enjoying the freedom which they so richly deserve and working side by side with all free nations to create a better and more prosperous world.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, independence day celebrations have different significance to different countries. The meanings such celebrations embody and the messages they convey vary greatly. Those fortunate peoples who have seldom had to struggle for their freedom in their homeland do not generally celebrate their independence days. Others who have taken their freedom for granted and have a rather vague idea about its meaning and significance celebrate it in a perfunctory manner and let it go at that. But with certain peoples it is a different, serious, and solemn matter; for them it is their national holiday, and as such they celebrate it with due solemnity and proper decorum. This is particularly so with peoples who in the past had their freedom and enjoyed national independence, but through some freakish turn of fortune, they had lost their independence and

had become subjects of foreign overlords in their homelands, and then once more they regained their independence. To them the celebrations of independence days seem to be of immense significance. This is true in the case of the Lithuanian peoples.

As the result of the Russian revolution of 1917 Lithuanians attained their national goal by proclaiming their independence on February 16, 1918, and then set up the Lithuanian Republic. Then for about 22 years they toiled, and enjoyed their freedom, and of course celebrated annually their independence day in their independent country. Since the outbreak of the last war, however, everything went wrong as far as small states in Eastern Europe were concerned, and then began the Lithuanian tragedy. Very early in the war they lost their independence and were enslaved by the Soviet agents. Thus for more than 25 years these people have been deprived of their most elementary rights, their freedom, and today they are suffering under Communist tyranny. On the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day we all hope and pray for their freedom.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. On that day in 1918, the hopes and aspirations of over four centuries were realized. That the spirit of the Lithuanian people had not flagged long before is a remarkable tribute to their indomitable will and their craving for freedom and self-determination. That they demonstrated, after 120 years of alien rule, a great capacity for democratic government, for cultural achievement, and for responsibility in world affairs, makes it all the more painful to find their nation once more subjected to foreign tyranny.

One might wonder at the apparent viability of the Lithuanian people, brutalized as they are by the Soviet Union; it might be reasoned that this suppression would be unbearable galling because Lithuania has a traditional reverence for political and religious freedom. However, let no man be deluded by the absence of a bloody revolution since the country's annexation by Russia in 1940. History shows that Lithuanian nationalism has not always manifested itself in armed revolts. For instance, in the 16th century, recognizing the common threat from the east, the Lithuanians reluctantly concluded a political union with Poland. However, they were careful to retain their own government, having its own treasury, armed forces, and law courts. And the distinct and rich Lithuanian culture was carefully preserved, and actually enjoyed its greatest development during the political amalgamation with Poland. True, this courageous people revolted often against czarist oppressors, in the full knowledge that if unsuccessful they would experience even greater cruelty and reprisals. But the Lithuanians have an unusual capacity for passive resistance, and it is this quality which sustains them now, and in which the Kremlin can find no solace or comfort.

# HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED: KING-ANDERSON OFFERS LITTLE AND AT A HEAVY COST—HER- LONG-CURTIS ELDERCARE HELPS THE AGED WITH HIGH MEDICAL EXPENSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H.R. 3728 a couple of weeks ago I was asked by television newscasters whether this was designed to defeat medicare. I replied that I did not know what "medicare" was, other than a label, and that I was not interested in beating anything. I was interested in solving the remaining problems that need solution in the field of health care for the aged, and I thought H.R. 3728 would accomplish this result.

## LET'S TELL THE TRUTH

It seems the order of the day to have bills labeled "truth in." There is the "truth-in-lending" bill, the "truth-in-packaging" bill. I think we need truth in labeling bills because there is so much untruth in the labels used today, beginning with the two "truth in" bills I have mentioned.

Now, what is medicare? What is the King-Anderson bill, King-Anderson No. 1 version, or King-Anderson No. 10 version now before the Ways and Means Committee?

Is the Ways and Means Committee which began meeting on January 27—and is still meeting to consider the King-Anderson bill—studying something or is it merely passing time? If it is studying something, what is it studying? If it is not studying something, why does it not just vote out "medicare," or this latest version of the King-Anderson bill? There are ample votes for the label.

The answer is, there are serious difficulties involved in getting at the problems in health care for the aged, not the least of which are identifying honestly what the problems are and what they are not. H.R. 1, the latest administration-sponsored version of the King-Anderson bill, is 150 pages long. What do these pages reveal, just words or problems?

## RUBBERSTAMP

The basic issue involved in the Ways and Means deliberations on the problem of health care for the aged is not this social problem, important as it may be. The basic issue involved is whether Congress is to live up to the concept of being a study and deliberative body or is to be merely a rubberstamp to pass out legislation which the executive branch of the Government has decided is good for the people. Is Congress job to look beneath the label of proposals to be certain that

what is in the bottle has been properly described on the label? As I put it to the newscasters, are the contents under the pretty label sarsaparilla, colored water, or poison?

Is the process of legislation merely to be one where the President decides what is good for the people and then, with his ability to utilize the news media, to develop popular support for this program, through attractive labeling, packaging, and advertising, thus forcing the program through the Congress? This is what increasingly is going on. Congress has been all too often pictured as a body of obstructionists, not students, unconcerned about the welfare of the people; as a body which must be pressured to do the right thing for the people. This is particularly the label given to the so-called conservatives in the Congress.

Now, are conservatives students, interested in the people and in solving social problems, or are they truly merely obstructionists living in the past, hoping for the good old days to return, and out of touch with modern reality? I am a conservative so, of course, I resent this as a false label.

If the news media had in the past or would now report the testimony and cross examination of the witnesses now appearing before the Ways and Means Committee on health care for the aged, the public would have some basis to make up their own minds on whether we have been or are now studying, or twiddling our thumbs. It is fairly easy to determine whether the questions posed by the committee members are important or merely time consuming. If the news media would report the problems as they are raised, studied and being debated, many people in the general public with knowledge in specific areas could assist us in coming up with better answers. As it is, the public can contribute little or nothing to the solution of the problems, nor can many Members of the Congress who are equally in the dark do much to help those of us in the committee.

## THE DILEMMA—HIGH TAXES AND LOW BENEFITS

Two problems face the administration as it seeks to press through H.R. 1, and these two problems clearly reveal themselves to be two horns going in opposite directions, a dilemma.

I asked Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen, if he and his associates had been in conference with the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the economists in the Treasury Department about the economic impact that might result if we were to increase the payroll tax from a \$4,800 base to a \$5,600 base and raise the rate to where, in 1972, it would be well over 10 percent of payroll, probably 11 percent. He answered:

Indeed we have, Congressman CURTIS, we have been in rather constant conference with them during the months of November and December on this matter. This is one reason we have cut back on the benefits in the bill.

Cut back, I might state, on the benefits in the bill which was in conference between the House and the Senate at the

time the Congress adjourned last year. This is one horn of the dilemma.

## A PUBLIC OUTCRY

Two Congressmen representing big city areas who are committed to voting out the label, whatever is in the package—and, incidentally, who attend practically none of the Ways and Means sessions—have said to me, "We are really going to catch it when H.R. 1 becomes law because the people think there are great benefits in the bill for them. When they find out the benefits are so limited and that they will get little or nothing, they will blame us."

## NOT COVERED—THE COSTLY ILLNESS

This is true, the benefits in the bill are strictly limited to people over 65 and they will cover, on an average, less than 25 percent of the medical expenses of a person over 65 experiencing a costly illness. The real problem for people over 65 is what we call catastrophic medical illness. Indeed, the problem for all families is not the average medical expenses a year—this average for people over 65 runs about \$350 to \$360—but the prolonged illness which runs into thousands of dollars of expense. H.R. 1 limits its benefits to 60 days in the hospital because—the Health, Education, and Welfare Department spokesmen say—only 3 to 5 percent of people over 65 stay in the hospital beyond 60 days. My rejoinder is, but these are the very ones who have the major problem. These are the cases that anyone can recite, and you yourselves recite them, that create the social problem. A catastrophic illness can break even a family of fairly well to do resources. H.R. 1 does nothing for these people—they are to be taken care of by Kerr-Mills and our present welfare programs even if H.R. 1 becomes law.

## WHAT IS THE PROBLEM? WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES?

The problems of health care for the aged largely arise because of the success, not the failure or inadequacy, of the health care system in our society. Our people are living 10 to 15 years longer than was anticipated at the time of their birth. The problem is an economic problem, not a medical problem. Medically the problem could be solved, by just not advancing any further in developing drugs, medical equipment, surgical techniques, medical knowledge; leveling off on our medical progress until our economies catch up with us. Or, just go back 30 years to the state of medical knowledge then. People would not have to finance an extra 10 to 15 years of life. It is important to point this out, because there are arguments advanced that the United States is behind the times because it is the only developed economy in the world which does not have a comprehensive governmental program for taking care of the medical costs of its people. This is true but, on the other hand, the United States, aside from having a topnotch health care system probably the best in the world, is the Mecca for the medical scholar. This is where the scientific breakthroughs into the unknown are occurring. I argue that it is



not by accident that innovation occurs where freedom exists and that it is damped where the benevolent but deadening hand of the powerful central political mechanism has been permitted to intervene.

If the problem is economic, what is its solution? I have argued that the solution lies in a three-pronged thrust on the part of all our society, not just the governmental sector. First, it lies in having available adequate low-cost facilities for our older population. There still are not sufficient safe, healthy, modern, economic, and therefore, low-cost nursing homes and other type living quarters for people over 65. I say still because, in 1960, I was able to have enacted into law an FHA guarantee program for the construction of private nursing homes which met these criteria. I tried to persuade lending institutions to lend money to have these facilities built, only to be told that these were "single purpose structures," which they are, but I argued "a purpose which will be with us for decades to come." Failing in my appeal to the private sector, I sought to utilize the political mechanism to accomplish what I thought was needed to meet this important aspect of the social problem. I am happy to report that since the bill has become law we have built approximately 100,000 new nursing home beds and now most of this building is being done without the governmental guarantee because the private lenders have seen that this is a good economic and social investment. The rate of building new nursing home beds is probably now close to 50,000 a year. In 1957 the average member of the American Nursing Home Association operated only 18 beds. 1964 data shows the average member now has a facility averaging 91 beds. I might add, I got little, or no help, in this matter from the HEW officials. I am happy to state, however, the Forand bill of 1960, which did not cover nursing home benefits, was amended with HEW approval to include them, and the subsequent versions of medicare, King-Anderson No. 1 through No. 10, have included this important area.

Second. We still need more people with nursing and medical skills, particularly of the "home care" variety, the Visiting Nurse technique. Much is being done in the private sector, but not enough. Since 1917, we have had a Federal aid to vocational education program—woefully obsolete, I might add, because its main thrust was to train people in agricultural skills. Through recent legislation, a number of interested Congressmen and myself were able to extend the vocational education program to include training for practical nursing. Again, I am happy to report, the more recent versions of medicare include provisions for home care treatment. The conservatives do have their impact from time to time.

Third. We still need a wider coverage of health insurance, with better quality and variety. Primarily we need more catastrophic health insurance to take care of the major medical expenses which is a dangerous risk to which all

families are subject. We also should further concentrate on prepaid health insurance—that is, health insurance the premiums for which are prepaid during the working years so that at the time of retirement this matter is largely out of the person's budget.

#### NOT INSURANCE

H.R. 1 does not provide prepaid health insurance, and those who claim it does are putting a false label on their product. Prepaid insurance of any sort requires creating a fund into which these prepaid funds go. This fund should be invested. There is no fund created by H.R. 1. The term "prepayment" is sometimes used to describe ordinary term health insurance—it means you prepay against the risk that you may have a medical bill in that year. This is not true prepayment. Furthermore, H.R. 1 does not even have that kind of prepayment. Under H.R. 1, persons will pay a payroll tax during their working years but will gain no benefits until they reach the age of 65. Their "insurance" then will not be paid for by the funds they have been paying in, because those "funds" will have already been paid out; but—hopefully—their "insurance" will be paid with the payroll taxes that the next generation will then be currently paying. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare makes no bones about this. This is not insurance as the general public understands insurance, the contracting for and the quality of which is regulated strictly by the 50 State insurance commissioners. It is social-insurance, and the hyphen must always be used to keep the label honest. This "social-insurance" depends for its actuarial soundness on its being compulsory and its proponents argue that it must also be practically universal in the society. It can be compulsory only through utilizing the powers of Government, and yet one generation cannot, under our form of government, or, indeed, from any practical standpoint, bind another generation. Thirty years from now a Congress representing the constituency of that day could decide not to pursue such a program further, and there would be no funds to pay for the health costs of those then over 65. The only reasons it needs to be practically universal, however, is to avoid the unfavorable contrast it would experience as the result of programs in the private sector.

#### RAPID INSURANCE GROWTH

To further the development of true health insurance programs three things must still be pushed.

First. Private insurance companies must continue the overall rapid pace of the past decade of covering people over 65 with health insurance. Ten years ago only 25 percent of our older people had any health insurance. Today over 60 percent of people over 65 are covered. This is at an even faster rate than the rapid rate of coverage of people under 65. Ten years ago 60 percent of people under 65 were covered; in 1963 the figure was over 79 percent. The 1964 figure will be close to 82 percent. The present momentum will keep the 60-percent figure of those over 65 rising, because over 80

percent of those now reaching 65 are covered by health insurance and those passing on are from groups with less than 30 percent coverage. The HEW officials, always on the negative side of progress in this field, ignore the progress but when presented with it respond by saying, "But the coverage is limited and inadequate," or that the rate of increased coverage might taper off. I daresay as we come close to a 100-percent coverage the rate will level out. They are correct however, in suggesting further improvement is needed in adequacy of coverage; however, again they ignore the progress and the innovation which is bound to produce further great progress in the adequacy of the coverage. The best test of adequacy of coverage is to be found in the annual figures of the amount of dollars health insurance companies have paid out in benefits. Ten years ago it was a little over \$1 billion. Today the figure is \$7 billion. In other words, not only have more people been covered by health insurance at an increasing rate, the quality and extent of their coverage has been increasing at an even more rapid rate.

Second. Catastrophic health insurance, which is increasingly becoming available on the market, must be further developed. Mainly, we must tell people that it exists. Here the negative approach of the government officials of HEW has been particularly obstructive, because not only have they failed to help in spreading the glad tidings, they have hampered its spreading. Many health insurance policies on the market now cover medical costs of \$15,000 and more, if a person wants it, on a comprehensive basis for all age groups. However, the cost of catastrophic health insurance is very reasonable. One carrier's premiums range from \$100 to \$140 a year, depending on the deductible feature. This insurance can be sold for this low premium because, although the case of the lingering and costly illness is a constant dread to almost all of us, the incidence of it occurring is remote. This is the high-cost-low-incidence-type risk which lends itself well to the insurance principle. Actually lingering illnesses are more prolonged when experienced by people under 65 than people over 65 because of their greater overall resiliency. Furthermore, people over 65 seldom have dependents like people under 65. Catastrophic health insurance, however, is needed by all age groups—those over 65 as well as those under 65.

Third. The greatest area for further movement, however, is in the prepaid insurance field. I refer to true prepaid insurance where the premiums for the years after 65 are paid for during the working years, say from 20 to 65. The additional premium cost to pay for the future premiums can be low for three reasons: First, it is 10 to 15 years of premium paid for over a period of 45 years; second, not all people in the group will reach 65, so all who do reach that age gain from the actuarial tables. The people who do not reach 65, of course, have had the protection that they might; and, third, the prepaid moneys are invested in the living economy and over a



period of 45 years. The return on this investment, largely in equities, compounded, will take care of two-thirds of the cost of the premiums. The great limitation on prepaid insurance of any sort, health or retirement, is the unfortunate record of governments generally in controlling inflation—keeping the purchasing power of the dollar constant. However, proper investment of the funds in equities can minimize the incidence of inflation. By correcting our Federal income tax laws, so we do not tax this inflation as if it were a capital gain, which, in truth, it is not, we could improve this protective investment device.

The Government can never offer true prepaid insurance because prepaid insurance presupposes creating a fund which is invested as I have described. Government can only invest in what is really a sterile investment, Government bonds, not in equities, not in real estate, not in the living and growing economy. Government bonds, we must remember, are primarily the result of military expenditures, current not capital expenditures, necessary, but economically sterile, preserving wealth but not promoting economic growth and, so, not able to share in it.

In 1962, I was able to bring about the passage of a law which moved prepaid health insurance forward considerably. This law permits our labor-management pension plans to include health insurance for the beneficiaries in their plans without losing their Federal corporate income tax exemption. There are over \$75 billion in the reserve funds of these plans now, invested largely in equities, for the benefit of 25 million employees. The recent autoworkers contracts include health insurance for the retirement years of their workers. The funds to back up this contractual commitment are derived from the principle of prepayment and investment.

H.R. 1 will badly damage, if not actually destroy, the development of prepaid health insurance. In the autoworkers contracts are provisions for abandoning this progress and relying upon H.R. 1 if it becomes law.

#### IN THE MEANTIME

In the meantime, to try to solve the problem of those people who have been born too soon, as it were, to gain the benefits of the innovation which is coming about so rapidly and which will soon close the gap, in complete coverage of our people with health insurance, two major programs have been instituted.

First. The various Connecticut 65 plans which offer health insurance, primarily of the catastrophic type, to people over 65 without a medical examination and permit no cancellation. Twenty States have moved to suspend the antitrust laws so the private insurance companies can pool to make available to their older people this type of protection. However, even though the premiums for these policies run around \$120 for the catastrophic part, there are some people who have difficulty meeting the premium; there are others who do not know about the availability of these programs or are not in an area where they can take advantage of them.

I think it is essential to pin one point down firmly if we can to permit no further equivocation, if we are to understand the problem that faces us.

#### ZEALOTS HURT U.S. IMAGE

All people in need in this country are provided for and this includes, of course, people over 65. They are provided for under the welfare programs. Therefore, in the discussions of what we might do in the field of health care for the aged, we are not talking about people who are not provided for. There are none. We are talking about how we can improve the programs we now have for them and for the entire society. In an attempt to dispel some of the demagoguery that has grown up around this subject of health care for the aged, I have stated that I know of no one in our society, rich or poor, young or old, who is not receiving adequate health care. If anyone knows of a person over 65—I have said over and over again—please call the matter to my attention, because there has been a mistake or an oversight, and I can direct that person to a program which will take care of him or her. Furthermore, by looking at the program on a specific case basis, we can find some true areas where improvement is needed. I first issued this public challenge many years ago, and I have repeated it often, and I repeat it now. There have been no takers. Certainly, we know this is true because whenever a case does occur, through error or ignorance, it hits the front pages of our newspaper immediately, as it should. However, I might point out that people abroad do not know this to be the truth and the demagogues, in their zeal to promote their pet theories to solve social problems, which in most instances study reveals they have failed to identify and to analyze properly, have badly hurt our image abroad. By promoting this false picture of need and neglect in the United States they have to some degree discouraged the leaders of backward societies where 90 percent of their people are in abject need to follow the path of freedom and hard work which lies at the base of our system to obtain a better life and to adopt the Communist philosophy of deadening individual initiative and so lessening the total work performed in the society.

#### TAKE CARE OF THOSE IN NEED

Yes, the question has been rather, how can we improve the programs we presently have for the people over 65 who did not have the programs that are coming into existence, available to them during their earning years? In coming up with an answer, we developed what is known as the Kerr-Mills Act. Note the attack on Kerr-Mills by those who seek to promote the King-Anderson bill; gone is the pretense that conservatives have no programs—the attack is against this affirmative program, and it has been vicious, untrue and unfair. Now, what does Kerr-Mills do? Does it require a demeaning needs test to qualify? Kerr-Mills does require a needs test, because it is an expansion of the old-age assistance program which, like all Government welfare programs, is financed by general revenue and, therefore, must have a

means test. Is it not remarkable that the attack on "means test" per se which exist in all our welfare programs—housing, aid to dependent children, veterans, Appalachia, or whatever—has been confined to the means test in Kerr-Mills? Actually, the basic thrust of the Kerr-Mills Act is to liberalize the means test which already exist in the old-age assistance programs. The theory behind the MAA program of the Kerr-Mills Act is this: We know people over 65 who are in need, who are "on relief," are being taken care of. However, we also surmise that there are some older families not on relief, who if they experience a major medical bill might have to go on relief. They might be forced to cash in their savings, even cut in on their pensions or have to sell their homes. We do not want this to have to happen, we want to keep them off relief, for humane reasons and also to save the Government money. So Kerr-Mills says, in effect, to the States, you can say to these people, "If you experience a major medical expense you can bring in these bills and we will pay them all, not just 25 percent of them, if that is what is necessary, so you will not have to cash in your savings or sell your home or to go on relief."

#### ADMINISTRATION ATTACKS

The administration has throughout denigrated and minimized the impact of Kerr-Mills. The cries even as late as last year were that the States were not implementing Kerr-Mills, although little work was done by these same people to encourage the use and development of Kerr-Mills. This cry is little heard today, 1965, because now all but eight States—regretfully including Missouri—have implemented the MAA program of Kerr-Mills. The States adopted this program, I might add, at twice the rate—36 States in 4 years—they adopted the "medical vendor program"—36 States in 8 years—which was the great reform of old-age assistance program in 1950, and now in force in all 50 States.

#### THE HERLONG-CURTIS APPROACH

My new bill, H.R. 3728, supported by the AMA and other groups interested in solving the still existing problems in health care for the aged, seeks to carry the Kerr-Mills principle one step further. It says: "Let us get health matters out of the welfare departments and put them in the health departments of the States, if we can. Let the health officials handle medical problems of the people not on relief but whom medical costs otherwise might force on relief." My bill would permit health insurance policies to be purchased for older people who cannot afford the premiums. Do not wait until the costs of a catastrophic illness hits them. Under my proposal, the States with Federal matching funds, would finance all or part of the cost of health insurance policies for the elderly depending on their income, and those with higher incomes could purchase the policies. Taxpayers would be permitted a full tax deduction for out-of-pocket expenses for medical care and for health insurance premiums. Deductions also are provided for supplying health insurance or medical care for aged dependents.



## BASIC DANGER OF KING-ANDERSON

The dangers of H.R. 1, aside from the fact that it fails to properly identify the problems of the older people and so fails to relate its benefits to their problems, are serious and many of them are incorrigible.

First, by overselling its benefits in order to promote its passage, great damage is likely to occur by people dropping their present health insurance programs thinking that now they are covered. Furthermore, there is going to be a very difficult problem on the part of the health insurance companies and pension plan managers in restructuring their present extensive and usually comprehensive programs to fit in with the obsolete approach taken in H.R. 1. The thrust of health insurance today is toward comprehensive policies, that is, policies that do not require the beneficiary to single out what is a drug charge, what is a hospital charge, what is a doctor's charge, and so forth, if it is a medical cost, the insurance policy covers it. H.R. 1 goes backward many years to what are largely obsolete-type policies by separating out that which is hospital charges from all other medical charges, drug bills, doctor's fees—indeed, all but hospital charges are excluded from the bill.

Second, we have a serious problem in increased health insurance premiums resulting from what is called overinsurance, people who are covered by two or three health policies collecting the same medical costs more than once. These people make money out of it and, in effect, raise the cost of the premiums that other people have to pay; these people make money out of going to the hospital, even for a rest. In all other insurance fields it is against the law and public policy to overinsure and, if a person is overinsured, it is unlawful for him to collect more than the amount of the insurable risk he has experienced. To illustrate the point, in fire insurance it was found that overinsurance encouraged arson—a person owning a \$15,000 building insured it with three different companies for a total of \$45,000. Such a person could make \$30,000 by burning the building down except for the State laws which now say, under these circumstances the three insurance companies must prorate their payments and together pay no more in total than the insurable risk, the true value of the building. This problem of overinsurance becomes important in considering H.R. 1, because the promoters of H.R. 1 are talking about the benefits provided "as being the base upon which our people will build their health insurance, like social security has become the base for retirement programs." This is a false presentation based upon a failure to distinguish between annuities and insurance against a risk. Of course, one wants his annuity, unlike insuring against a risk, to be as high as possible. Insurance against a risk must be limited to what the insurable risk amounts to, the actual costs a person experiences if he gets sick or has an accident. Once a person is covered by comprehensive medical insurance, he does not have to

be covered twice; indeed, it should be clearly against public policy if he were to be overinsured and covered twice. Incidentally, there is loss-of-income health insurance too, but this also should be limited to what a person's actual wages or salary would have been if he had been well and able to work.

## IMPACT OF HIGHER PAYROLL LEVY

Third, I have merely alluded to but not discussed the economic consequences of increasing the payroll tax beyond a certain level. There are two areas of concern.

First. What the payroll tax does, if too high, to the prices of goods and services we sell in competition with people abroad. It was this aspect which seemed to concern the President's economic advisers the most. It is a matter of serious concern, but not as serious, in my mind, as the second problem.

Second. What the payroll tax does to the incident of unemployment through the encouragement it gives to further rapid automation—replacing manpower with machines—replacing labor with capital. I think in the long run automation is a blessing for all of us, but there is no escaping the fact that in the short range it creates unemployment and dislocation of people. Men lose their jobs through obsolescence and they have to learn the new skills for which the automation creates a demand at the same time it is destroying jobs. Innovation can be so rapid that we have difficulty to cope with the problems it creates. If we are not attuned to meet the problems it creates, its damage can outweigh its benefits. The problems of health care for the aged today have resulted, to a large degree, as I have pointed out from rapid advancement which we were not prepared to meet fully. People are living 10 to 15 years longer and, as a result, new economic problems have been created.

The administration spokesmen said that the President's economic advisers did not think the problem of the payroll tax vis-a-vis unemployment was a serious one. This is understandable on their part. For 4 years the administration has treated the unemployment problem as one resulting from the lack of aggregate demand and not one primarily the result of rapid automation, and the unemployment rate is still 5 percent—the poorest record for any recovery period of the four World War II recessions. At the same time we see this inadequate concern and treatment of the problems of unemployment on the part of the administration, we still see our economy slowed down, on the employment side because of a shortage of skills—especially in the service field in which education and health predominate—a shortage of nurses, doctors, and teachers, to be specific. The payroll tax is increasingly becoming a factor of importance in encouraging further replacement of manpower with machines. The payroll tax is not levied on a machine. It is only applied to human beings. There is no question that the saving of 10 percent of wage costs is a further encouragement to buying a machine and laying off men. The total payroll tax

already is 10 percent of payroll because not only is the social security system based upon the payroll tax, so is the unemployment insurance system and, in actual effect, the workmen's compensation system.

## REGRESSIVE TAX

Furthermore, the payroll tax is probably the most regressive tax we have on our books. It taxes only the lowest portion of the income earned from salaries and wages. All income from interest, dividends, capital gains, oil royalties, and so forth is excluded from the payroll tax. The payroll tax rate, unlike the personal income tax rate, is the same for everyone—the \$5,600 wage earner and the \$2,000 wage earner. There are no personal exemptions to the payroll tax for dependents—a bachelor pays no more and no less than a man with a wife and five children.

Some large corporations have quietly moved over to support this new payroll tax increase upon which H.R. 1 is to be financed. Why? I suggest because, under pension plans for which they are paying, or will be, as they adopt the new health care prepaid insurance programs, like in the United Auto Workers' recent contracts, the health costs of their retirees is paid for through the corporate income tax—money put into pension plans is a deductible item from the corporate income tax. If they can shift the cost of these health insurance programs from the corporate income tax to the payroll tax, they feel it is to their advantage. I disagree with both their social and their economic theories, but not their logic. It is difficult to understand how national labor leaders can advocate such a policy or why they wish to remove this item from the agenda subject to collectively bargaining.

## FREEZES PROGRESS

The greatest danger of H.R. 1, however, lies in what it does to innovation upon which the future of health care for all of us is based. The 150 pages of H.R. 1 are largely taken up with setting out the methods and the guidelines under which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to enter into the contracts with the hospitals and other purveyors of medical services.

H.R. 1 starts out with a statement proclaiming that nothing in this bill shall permit the Federal Government to interfere with the free operation of the hospitals or the right of a person to the doctor of his choice. These are brave words, but they are meaningless because the rest of the bill is taken up with just how this interference is to be handled.

It should be made quite clear that I am not saying the authors and the promoters of H.R. 1 do not sincerely wish to have this freedom remain, but it is to say that they have muddled their thinking. Let me put it upon the positive basis which the authors of H.R. 1 will accept. They believe it is necessary to improve the standards presently existing in our 7,000 hospitals throughout the country, not to mention the standards of nursing homes and home care services. They see in this bill a practical method of improving these standards.



They are right on both counts. First, the standards need improving. I trust our society never reaches the point where this is not true because, if we did, it would mean that we were complacent and that we had stopped innovation. Second, at any given time we can stop research and development to freeze on the best design research and development up to that point can give us. In military weaponry, as well as in private manufacturing, this is always the crucial question—when do we stop research and development to freeze on design so we can go into mass production? If one freezes too soon, one ends up with quantity with some sacrifice to quality. If one freezes too late—vis-a-vis an enemy—one might have the superior quality—as Nazi Germany did with the V-2 weapons—but insufficient quantity, and possibly at the sacrifice of collateral developments.

So it is true we can use the Federal political mechanism at any time to cash in on the great research and development which is going on in the field of health, to freeze on a national design. I am certain that at most any time, whether the field be health care for the aged or what, we can improve any system in our society by doing so. Yes, for 5 years perhaps, we gain the benefit—but what happens for the next 10 years, or for the next 20 years, the progress of which depends so much on the research and development of today? The price we pay comes from cutting down on innovation and it is entirely too high a price in peacetime. It is a price we should pay only when, for reasons of crisis, we have to go to what we call a crash program.

When there is no enemy breathing down our backs—or competitor in automobiles—we do well to move cautiously in any freezing of design to obtain mass production or establishing national standards to gain a momentary increase in national quality. Proper observance will give us steady progress and can prevent crises which result in costly crash programs. There is enough progress made in a dynamic marketplace where new ideas are proven to be right and more ideas are proven to be wrong, toward adopting improvements in standards, without calling upon the political mechanism of the society to step in to make the judgments. Justice Brandeis observed that we have 48 laboratories—there are now 50—to test out new ideas in the field of political science, and we should use them. I point out that actually we have 100,000 laboratories—there are that many taxing units in our society, each headed by its own directors or executive officer, whether it be in a school district, a sewer district, a county or municipal government—where ideas in the field of political science are constantly being tested. We should use them, and certainly I want us to use the millions of business laboratories in the field of economics—and the 200 million consumers who cast their economic ballots in the marketplace, all of which 7,000 hospitals are a part.

The officials of HEW have said to me, "But presently the hospitals make arrangements with Blue Cross in respect

to the fees the hospitals charge and the services for which they expect to be paid. What is the difference between the present procedures in the marketplace which you approve and those which H.R. 1 sets up, of having the Government perform this function, particularly if the Government uses the Blue Cross organization?" Well, the obvious answer is partly hidden in semantics. Just what is Blue Cross? The Blue Cross organization consists of 80 independent regional boards, each negotiating with the hospitals in its region on these matters. The hospital boards and the Blue Cross boards are therefore on a more or less equal status.

Furthermore, in these same geographical regions are private insurance companies competitors in considerable degree of the Blue Cross boards who are engaged in a similar process of conducting a constant dialog with the hospital boards. On the fee they charge and the services they rendered, what would a hospital in St. Louis, Mo., let alone a little hospital in Douglas, Mich., do when it came up against the great Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an arm of the Federal Government, in disagreement on a cost item or type of service, particularly a new one it had developed? H.R. 1 perhaps contemplates the use of the Blue Cross, but not the 80 Blue Cross boards. Interrogation in the Ways and Means Committee reveals the plan to be to utilize the rather recent national Blue Cross structure which was set up to handle some national contracts like the United Steelworkers which have recently been entered into.

#### FEDERAL CONTROL

The test to apply throughout the 150 pages of H.R. 1, is whether the ultimate control is not vested in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington regardless of the intermediate mechanisms established. Where there is an honest difference of opinion between a hospital board and the HEW, how is the final determination made? There is no question that the ultimate decision rests in the political government in Washington. The final decision almost has to be vested there. The Congress is dealing with taxpayers' funds and it must be certain that these funds are being spent according to certain specific criteria. If the criteria are too vague, we create government by men, not laws. If too specific, we produce a straitjacket. Either result—government by men or a straitjacket, or really anything in between, is destructive to innovation.

We gain further insight when we take a specific cost item presently in dispute and already subjected to debate in the committee. Run this item of dispute through the mechanisms established in H.R. 1 and we gain some insight of the problems we are creating.

Presently many hospitals have an overcharge for part of the cost of teaching, research and development, bad debts, and for that part of the charity patients cost not taken care of by the Government welfare and community chest programs, which they prorate to the paying beds. Under H.R. 1, none of these items, prorated or otherwise, can

be charged to the patients over 65 for payment. The HEW argument is that with H.R. 1, there will no longer be any charity patients over 65 or bad debts. Accordingly, this program under H.R. 1 will improve the financial position of the hospitals in respect to these items.

In theory, this sounds sensible. When applied to the actual situation it is not. For years studies presented to the Ways and Means Committee from all sections of the country showed that the best paying group by age, as far as medical bills were concerned, by a considerable margin, were the people over 65. Of course, these statistical studies did not conform to the program that the administration was trying to sell the public, based, as it was, on the assumption that people over 65 were in a relatively poor fiscal position. These data, accordingly, have remained in the published hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, unnoticed and their import disregarded. However, in looking into the situation of the hospitals which have charity patients we find—I am now quoting the statistics of a specific hospital which I believe is fairly typical—only 5 percent of its charity beds are occupied by people over 65, while 13 percent of its paying beds are occupied by people over 65. In other words, H.R. 1 will absorb the cost of the 5 percent of the charity beds but will deny to the hospital the prerogative of passing on, on a pro rata basis, part of the costs of the 95 percent charity patients who are under age 65 to the 13 percent pay beds occupied by people over 65. The hospital's point is that they have to be certain that their pay beds are filled with people to whom they can pass on this prorated overload. Under H.R. 1, these people would probably not be persons over 65. Unless this disagreement is resolved in accordance with the true situation, H.R. 1 could actually result in discrimination against people over 65 in many of our hospitals.

This is only an illustration to demonstrate the kind of honest disagreements that can develop between individual hospitals and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, over accounting systems, social values, health values, teaching values, values in research, and development. It does not require much imagination to see what mischief this will cause in a field which is so dynamic and so full of change as is the field of health care, particularly institutional care such as provided by hospitals and nursing homes.

The American Hospital Association in its recent testimony provided the committee with a figure which, more than any other I have seen, dramatizes the tremendous progress that has gone on in the field of institutional health care, particularly hospital health care, in recent years, and, at the same time, explains some of the reasons for the high cost of hospitals which will continue to go up if there is continuing progress in American health care. Fifteen years ago, the testimony reveals, the new hospitals being built had 60 percent of their space set aside for beds and 40 percent for laboratories, operating rooms, and so forth. Today 15 percent of the space of



newly designed hospitals is for beds and 85 percent is for the laboratories, and so forth.

#### GIVE THE PEOPLE A CHOICE

This is no time, I would argue, to freeze on design in either the field of health care or health insurance. This is the time, as always, to continually capitalize on the progress that has been made and to spread the benefits more widely, but this must be done with great care, through calm study and understanding lest the very process of innovation be damaged. We are engaged in our society in producing a bigger pie so that the pieces for all of us will be bigger. If we are diverted from this work by those who wish to spend their time seeing whether Joe has a bigger piece than James, then I submit both Joe and James are going to end up with smaller pieces than they otherwise would have, though I do not doubt the smaller pieces might be more equal. Perhaps we are reaching the stage where we can apply the solution many parents have found to be feasible among children to stop the squabbles over who is going to get the biggest piece. Let whoever is arguing over the biggest piece be permitted to cut the pie, and then let the others get first choice of the piece he wishes.

Let those who wish to establish Government programs to perform services for the people only be permitted to do so, if the people themselves have the choice of which program they prefer—that which the Government provides or that which they can obtain for themselves in the private sector.

It is anomalous that in retirement programs the Federal Government as an employer has given its employees a private retirement system which is quite adequate and does not force them into the compulsory social security retirement system, yet it forbids any private employer or group of private employees to have this kind of choice. Under H.R. 1 the Federal Government would do the same in the field of health care, letting its employees escape the payroll tax, but continue instead the superior health insurance system they presently have.

#### SHODDY, COMPULSORY

I think it is little short of tragic when the Federal Government seeks to use its vast powers to force people to accept a service which many of us are convinced is shoddy, out of date, and deleterious to society itself, and bases the fiscal soundness of this service on the fact that it is compulsory. Why not at least permit the people to have their choice of which piece of pie they think is the bigger?

#### IS POWER REALLY RECLAMATION'S PAYING PARTNER? OR HOMINY DOMINY SAT ON THE WALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the interesting opportunity to reply to perhaps one of the most inept

statements I have ever seen coming out of a supposedly responsible Government bureau. This opportunity presented itself as a result of a statement I made before the annual convention of the National Reclamation Association in Palm Springs, Calif., last November. The thesis of my remarks was, "Is Power Really Reclamation's Paying Partner?" In attendance at that meeting was the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy. Several weeks later the Commissioner wrote a letter to the National Reclamation Association president, Mr. Hugh A. Shamberger, which purported to be his rebuttal of my statement. The Commissioner also took the liberty of sending copies of his letter to all of the National Reclamation Association board of directors and to all members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which I have the privilege of serving as ranking minority member.

As I sat alone in the quietness of my office one evening carefully reading the Commissioner's letter, I could not help but be reminded of the quotation from Voltaire who once wrote:

I have never made but one prayer to God, a very short one: "O Lord, make my enemies ridiculous." And God granted it.

Commissioner Dominy's attempted rebuttal certainly seemed to fit this response.

Another, and seemingly unrelated, thought also kept running through my mind, reminding me of a simple little nursery rhyme which we all learned at our mother's knee. But the rhyme came out something like this:

Hominy Dominy sat on the wall.  
Hominy Dominy had a great fall.  
And all Udall's horses and all Udall's men,  
Couldn't put Hominy Dominy together again.

The more I read the Commissioner's feeble attempts at rebuttal, I realized that in fairness, Mr. Shamberger and the conscientious reclamationists who make up the board of directors of the National Reclamation Association deserved a clarification of the facts in this matter. So, last week I sent Mr. Shamberger a letter in which I pointed out that it was not my intention to prolong this exchange with Commissioner Dominy but I was taking this opportunity of availing myself of the debater's traditional prerogative—the affirmative has the surrebuttal. Furthermore, since the Commissioner feels some Members of the House of Representatives will be interested in his remarks, I am sure the entire House will also be interested in them along with my reply.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be complete on this matter, I insert at this point in my remarks the text of my original statement before the National Reclamation Association convention in Palm Springs, Calif., on November 12, 1964, entitled "Is Power Really Reclamation's Paying Partner?"

#### IS POWER REALLY RECLAMATION'S PAYING PARTNER?

The reclamation program in the Western States is in serious trouble; and, in part, it is of your own making. I realize this is fully recognized by your own organization

because of expressions of concern received by me and other Members of Congress in recent months.

It should not be necessary to tell you that reclamation has been and should continue to be a vital factor in the growth and prosperity of our Nation. It is not my purpose here today to preach to you or to criticize some of your activities but rather to discuss and evaluate some of the ways the reclamation program has gone wrong. You know as well as I that the Federal reclamation program was begun over a half a century ago for the primary purpose of reclaiming the arid, barren lands of the West in order to make them productive. For many years the program continued along those lines and was well received by the general populace and the elected representatives in Washington. However, there is now substantial opinion in both political parties, in the House of Representatives and the Senate that irrigation—the basic justification of reclamation projects—has been subordinated to other purposes in too many situations.

In the past few years particularly, the policies and programs of the career employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have wandered so far afield from the basic goal that it seems reclamation has become of only incidental importance. The present officials of the Bureau of Reclamation have become so preoccupied with efforts to develop unnecessary hydroelectric power projects and Federal power transmission grids that their thinking has become as arid and barren as the western lands they were formerly charged with reclaiming. As a result of this attitude and effort and other unfortunate policies, there is a serious danger of sincere reclamation proposals falling into disrepute with Members of Congress.

Unfortunately, the farmers dependent upon irrigation have permitted this situation to develop and continue through ignorance or selfishness or complacency. I know too many of you too well to think you are ignorant of the facts or are selfish concerning the future of the program. For this reason, I can only conclude that complacency is the basic cause of your inactivity in this vital area. This is not the time for complacency or inactivity, this is the time for positive and constructive action if you have any hope of reclaiming the reclamation program from the forces which are striving mightily to subvert honest irrigation needs for their selfish goal of using water projects to develop Federal electric power for power's sake.

This subversion of irrigation has proceeded to such a point, in fact, that at a hearing earlier this year before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee one of my colleagues from the eastern part of the United States suggested the Bureau of Reclamation change its name to the Bureau of Federal Power. For this reason, I repeat a positive action program is necessary by all dedicated irrigators to reclaim the reclamation program for its original purpose before it's too late.

In all fairness it should be admitted that this shift in emphasis in the Federal program has been so skillfully handled that many people cannot be blamed for not being aware of it. In the beginning reclamation projects were planned for the basic purpose of irrigation. But it was soon recognized that the energy of water falling over the dam could be converted into hydroelectric power where economically feasible. It was clearly understood, however, that hydroelectric power was to be an incidental function. The program really began going astray when the Federal power advocates began selling the Congress and the irrigators a bill of goods claiming that power was really the "paying partner" or the cash register in the reclamation movement. Let's take just a moment to look more closely at this claim that hydroelectric power is a paying part-



ner. There is strong evidence that in many instances power has become a burden on other project purposes, particularly irrigation.

The Bureau of Reclamation, in a report issued last January, entitled, "Power Systems, Average Rate and Repayment Studies," lists 25 existing Bureau projects with power facilities which have cost about \$9.8 billion. Almost half of this cost has been allocated to irrigation, and power revenues supposedly will repay nearly two-thirds of the irrigation allocation.

However, a considerable number of these projects are in serious financial trouble. For example, the Missouri River Basin project is a clear example of the plight in which reclamation finds itself. A good part of reclamation's difficulties in the Missouri Basin can be traced directly to the power pricing policy adopted there.

The Bureau of Reclamation's study I just mentioned, shows a cost of \$2.8 billion for the Missouri Basin irrigation facilities, and assumes that \$2.2 billion—practically all—of this cost will be repaid from power revenues.

Seven out of nine units of the project have allocations above \$500 per acre for irrigation costs to be repaid from power revenues. The allocations for repayment from power revenue range as high as \$1,243 per acre for the Almira unit. The total per-acre costs for the Almira unit are \$1,446.

But what is the actual situation?

An audit by the General Accounting Office in 1960 found that the power operations of the Missouri River Basin project had accumulated a deficit of \$51 million from annual losses going back to 1954.

The Comptroller General reported that at the existing power rates it will not be until the year 2027—63 years from now—that repayment of the non-interest-bearing construction cost subsidy to irrigation will even begin. Full repayment is not expected until almost the turn of the 22d century.

How can it be truthfully claimed that power is a paying partner of irrigation when it isn't even paying its own way? It may also be asked with candor whether the power facilities at the Missouri River Dams will even be capable of operating at the time when repayment of the irrigation features is supposed to begin.

This is a clear example of what is allowed to happen when Federal power is produced and marketed for its own sake at an unrealistically low "postage stamp" rate rather than being used as a paying partner for irrigation and other project purposes. If this power were intended to be incidental and to be a paying partner, the price would have to be increased substantially to assure repayment of project costs on time.

In an effort to correct this situation, the Congress earlier this year added a proviso in the new Missouri River Basin authorization bill requiring that any new unit of the project be authorized or reauthorized before any funds may be spent on it. In addition, the Department of the Interior has also taken some steps to correct this unhappy situation.

The emphasis in the Missouri Basin seems to have been on extending transmission lines and selling power to preference customers, who already were being served from other sources. It may not be of direct concern to the National Reclamation Association that these customers have been lured by low rates away from their previous suppliers. But it should be of great concern to you that this Missouri Basin power was priced at less than its market value to make that possible, while the project deficit has increased year by year, and the schedule of repayments of irrigation features has been steadily extended into the far distant future.

The interrelationship of power and irrigation has also been distorted in areas served

by the Bonneville Power Administration. There you find a glaring example of obsession with unrealistically low power rates while irrigation is pushed into the background. And I need not point out that as a result of the passage of the Northwest regional preference bill during the recent session of Congress, preference customers of BPA now include industrial plants and private power companies.

You all know BPA has been operating at a loss. Its annual operating deficit has been highly publicized. An audit by the Comptroller General showed that in 6 years through 1963, the total deficit from its power operations reached more than \$50 million and it is expected to rise to nearly \$60 million by 1965. Certainly power cannot be called a paying partner of irrigation in the Pacific Northwest so long as this situation continues.

One of the reasons for the deficits of these basin developments is the construction of added units with higher power costs than the original development without a corresponding adjustment in power rates. Naturally this practice dilutes earnings and extends the payout schedule. How could it do otherwise? The inevitable result is a reduction in the ability of the power units in the project as a whole to repay irrigation costs.

In the Columbia Basin power system the installed generating capacity in 1950 was just under 2 million kilowatts, and the cost of power generation and transmission was 1.39 mills per kilowatt-hour. What was the situation 11 years later? In 1961 generating capacity had tripled to more than 6 million kilowatts. The cost of generation and transmission also rose. In fact, it more than doubled, to 2.86 mills. In place of a net profit from power at the 2-mill Bonneville sales rate, which has remained unchanged for a quarter of a century, there was a net loss of \$14 million in 1961.

This is why I say that reclamation has come under a cloud. The story has been repeated too often. The power operations of the Rio Grande project have been losing money in every year since 1951.

It is highly doubtful that the Colorado-Big Thompson project power will ever become the paying partner of irrigation.

A glaring example of the problem before us may be cited to dramatize what has happened to reclamation and why it is falling into disrepute—the proposed Burns Creek project in Idaho.

First an attempt was made to obtain authorization for this project as a reclamation project—which it was not. Then, when its sponsors failed before the Interior Committee, they went to the Public Works Committee, where an attempt was made to justify it as a flood control project—which it was not. But this effort also failed.

When this project was being considered by the House Interior Committee, it was shown that although the power produced at Burns Creek standing alone would be very costly, it would be marketed at a price substantially below its cost of production. This unusual result would be accomplished by combining Burns Creek power with that from a good reclamation project—which I supported—Palsades Dam. All of the power would be sold at rates yielding an average of about 3.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

For the power facilities of the Burns Creek project to pay out in 50 years, the resulting power would have to sell for an average of at least 4.88 mills per kilowatt-hour. Nevertheless, the Department of the Interior told our committee that power from Burns Creek would be marketed at the same rate as the power from Palsades Dam. This would mean that on the average it would be sold at about 1.18 mills per kilowatt-hour less than its cost of production.

This kind of financial juggling proved to me that the Burns Creek project actually

would be detrimental to reclamation, to the water users, and to the taxpayers. The Palsades project standing alone without Burns Creek would repay all of its reimbursable costs by 1988, and by the year 2006 a surplus of \$22,245,333 would be built up from earnings of Palsades. Under existing law, this would go to the Treasury, and, should Congress so desire, it would be available to finance additional reclamation projects, the cost of which might be beyond the financial capacity of water users.

But should Burns Creek and Palsades market their power at the Palsades rate, then all of the reimbursable costs of the two projects would not be recovered until the end of year 2006. Thus, \$22,245,333 would be diverted from the Treasury to subsidize the users of Burns Creek power.

This is the sort of radical departure from the normally accepted principle of Federal reclamation policy that prevents power from being the paying partner of reclamation.

Although Burns Creek has not been authorized, there is an example right here in California of another project that was authorized and is now in existence despite an indisputable showing that its power features, if developed by the Federal Government, would be a financial hindrance, not a help, to further water development in the State. This project is the Trinity unit of the Central Valley project.

The debate on Trinity in the Congress deteriorated into who should build the power facilities, the Federal Government or the local utility company. The interest of reclamation once again was ignored, as it so often has been in the past. Preference customers more interested in a vested claim on the electric power succeeded in making Trinity an all-Federal project.

Today the Trinity power, costing at least 7½ mills to generate, is being sold to them at the Central Valley project "postage stamp" rate of 4½ mills, a loss of 3 mills or more for each kilowatt-hour sold.

The evidence presented at our committee hearing made it clear that construction of the Trinity River project with Federal power facilities, as has been done, would take about \$146 million out of the Central Valley project bank account. The CVP enabling act says power shall be generated and sold "as a means of financially aiding and assisting" the irrigation or water features of the project.

Does the power from the Trinity unit honestly aid and assist water development?

Obviously it does not. Year by year this power is depleting the CVP surplus, leaving less money for irrigation rather than more.

But, this is not the end of the story. There is now still another proposal for another addition to the Central Valley project which promises similar harm to power's ability to continue as a paying partner of reclamation. This is the Auburn unit. It was reported out of committee but was not passed in the recent session. However, it will undoubtedly be urged again next year.

Another part of this problem is exemplified by the recently authorized Pacific Northwest-Southwest Intertie between the Bonneville Power Administration, California, and Arizona. An appropriation of \$45 million was made to start this project, which will involve an estimated expenditure by the Federal Government of \$300 million as its share in this joint undertaking with local public and private utilities. But, only rarely was a question raised in defense of reclamation, concerning the possible effect on reclamation projects in California, Arizona, or Nevada.

For example, have any reclamationists considered the fact that a portion of the costs of the intertie will be included as a part of the cost of the Central Valley project? Do they know that \$2.3 million, which



was included in this year's public works appropriation bill will be a part of the Central Valley project's budget? Or that a still larger figure can be attributed this year to region No. 3 of the Bureau of Reclamation?

Do they know that the Federal portion of this four-line intertie will add over \$100 million to the Interior Department's budget requests in future years for the Bureau of Reclamation?

Do they realize that more than \$57 million was appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal 1965 for transmission lines and related facilities? This represents more than 17 percent of all reclamation funds appropriated this past year. And, if other power features were added, such as switchyard, penstocks, generators, and so forth, as well as the share of the cost of major structures such as dams that are allocated to power, then power's share of the total Federal budget would be much, much greater.

You have to ask yourself, "Is this good for reclamation?" A little soul searching should leave no doubt about it. It cannot possibly be. Power isn't the problem in the reclamation States. The problem is water. When power can be produced economically enough to reduce the cost of water, it is an assist to reclamation. When the reverse is true, it is a liability and should be carefully avoided.

The continued submission to Congress of projects like these is one of the reasons I say that the entire reclamation program is in jeopardy. If the rising animosity toward reclamation in the nonreclamation States which reflects itself in Congress is to be allayed, everyone interested in the matter should concern himself, and now, with the policy used in the pricing of power from new reclamation projects.

Of course, it cannot be sold above the cost of power from alternate sources in the same area; but, it certainly could be sold at no lesser price. This alternate price figure is used in determining the cost-benefit ratio of the project. Why should it not be used in the actual payout of the facility?

Congress should include a provision in any future authorizing legislation stating that power from projects is not to be sold at less than the actual cost of its production. If actual cost is above alternative costs in the area, then Congress should know that authorization of a project with power facilities will be a drain on other reclamation purposes.

But, let us not be misled into believing that only the Federal power aspect of the reclamation program needs changing. I think there are also some improvements necessary in the method of considering irrigation costs in Federal projects. One of the first such improvements might be enactment of legislation to clarify the amortization of the irrigation portion of multiple-purpose hydro developments to ease the burden on the already overburdened Nation's taxpayers.

When the reclamation program first began, irrigators who benefited directly were required to repay the total allocated costs in a 10-year period without interest. But, through a series of subsequent acts of Congress, they now repay only a small portion of the irrigation cost allocation—still without interest—in 50 years plus a 10 year development period. The remainder—and usually this is by far the larger portion of the irrigation allocation—is repaid from power revenues and still this is without interest. Frequently the anticipated revenues from irrigation are not adequate to repay the cost allocated to irrigation.

The so-called Collbran formula, developed in 1952 for the Collbran reclamation project in Colorado, is in part responsible for this situation. The formula provides that construction costs allocated to irrigation but beyond the ability of the water users to repay be liquidated from power revenues after

the costs allocated to power have been repaid. This might be considered as a balloon payment at the end where nothing is paid on the principle for 50 years and then a large or a balloon payment is made at the end to payoff the irrigation allocation.

The relative unfairness of this arrangement was recognized as far back as 1955 by the Second Hoover Commission which stated in the Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power:

"The currently proposed Collbran formula, under which the part of the cost of a project allocated to power would be paid off within a 50-year period and then payments made to retire the interest-free investment in the project, should be examined with care. Under certain conditions its application may result in a large subsidy being imposed on the taxpayer, but the objectionable feature, to the task group, is the long delay in a return on a portion of the Federal investment. Too much can happen in a 50-year period, if all are to be treated fairly, to defer payment on a project whose eventual cost is very likely to be underestimated at the time of authorization."

This type of subsidy is not only unfair to the general taxpayer public but it is also unfair to the vast majority of the Nation's irrigators. It may be noted in the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1963 that there are over 33 million acres in this country under irrigation. While, at the same time, there is a little more than 3 million acres under irrigation from Federal reclamation projects. In other words, over 90 percent of the irrigated land of the United States is being provided by hard-working farmers using their own initiative and relying on non-Federal methods of meeting their problem while paying the full cost of their obligation.

Before some Federal bureaucrat attempts to challenge my use of national irrigated acres data since the Federal reclamation program applies only to the West, let me say that over two-thirds of the Nation's irrigated land is located in the West. So, even considering only those western acres, it is still grossly unfair to the seven farmers doing it on their own as compared with the one farmer who is depending on the Federal Government.

To correct this inequity, I think the repayment formula for Federal water projects should be changed in such a way as to require that the irrigation allocation beyond the ability of water users to repay should be concurrently amortized with the power costs. This could be done by making incremental payments annually to the retirement of both elements of cost.

Furthermore, there can be little justification in my mind for the continuation of the policy of charging no interest on the portion of the irrigation costs which is repaid from power revenues. It is all right for the Federal Government to charge no interest to the water users for the small part of the allocation which they must repay. But, I propose that the repayment formula be further changed to require an interest charge be placed on the amount of the irrigation cost allocation of any Federal water project that must be repaid from power revenues. This interest charge should be identical with the rate of interest applied to the power portion of the project.

There is one final problem I would like to discuss with you. At present, there are almost 30 Federal agencies dealing with various aspects of water resources developments. This is a large number of agencies; and, undoubtedly, there is much overlapping with many millions of dollars of wasteful expenditures resulting. Without a doubt there is a tremendous room for improving the administrative organization in this important field of Government activity; but I realize,

as I know you do, that there is no easy solution.

There are various types of Federal activity in the water resources field. For example, the gathering of basic information about water resources such as is done by the Geological Survey. The planning of water resources projects is done by such agencies as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. Construction of water resources projects under contract or by direct force account is also done both by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Federal Power Commission also gets in the act by its authority to license hydroelectric projects on navigable waters.

If all of the water resources agencies were combined in one of the regular executive departments, this would mean that the regulatory functions of the Federal Power Commission would be placed in that executive agency. I, for one, would not necessarily wish to propose that solution.

The difficulties of consolidating all the Federal water agencies are further illustrated by the problem of determining what basic law would govern the single agency. For instance, should the 160-acre limitation applicable to projects of the Bureau of Reclamation be extended to water projects of other agencies?

I cite these various problems merely to indicate some of the difficulties which would be involved in any proposal for consolidating water resources agencies. This does not mean, however, that nothing should be done. I feel that it is imperative for the Congress to give careful consideration to an attempt to bring order out of chaos and establish the most efficient and economical organization possible out of this Nation's farflung water resources agencies.

Personally, I am ready to accept the challenge of this problem by suggesting the extension of the reclamation type of activities to all 50 States in the Union. This new agency would have the exclusive jurisdiction over the planning and construction of hydroelectric developments and an entirely new body of law should be written to regulate its activities. This would be a difficult assignment; but, with a little bit of initiative and imagination, it can be done.

Yes, my friends, the reclamation program is in serious trouble. I have tried to point out some of the reasons for this situation, and in a small way some of the possible solutions to the problems. These solutions, I am the first to admit, will involve controversy. But, is the National Reclamation Association going to stand on the sidelines and say it does not want to become involved—it wants to avoid controversy? To take such an attitude toward the damaging trend that I have described will only serve to harm the movement you have fostered so long, with such notable benefit to the development of the West.

You should not be afraid of getting into a fight in which the best interests of reclamation are at stake. Nor should you allow yourselves to be used for purposes which do not further the basic needs of reclamation, but instead are aimed at achievement of an ideological goal no matter what the cost.

This is your program—this is your problem. Unless you take a more positive and creative attitude toward finding solutions to this problem, some future historian will look back and say that "Rarely have those who had so much to lose done so little to prevent it." The choice is yours.

Mr. Speaker, my recent letter to Mr. Shamberger was designed to respond serially to the various statements made by Commissioner Dominy. For this reason and to make a reading of both statements more comprehensive, I will insert my own comments after the various



statements of the Commissioner. Now for Hominy Dominy's letter and my comments. He began:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,  
Washington, D.C., December 11, 1964.

Mr. HUGH A. SHAMBERGER,  
President, National Reclamation Association,  
Carson City, Nev.

DEAR Mr. SHAMBERGER: As I promised during the recent convention of the National Reclamation Association, I have reviewed the remarks by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, to the convention and offer the following comments.

In his address, Mr. SAYLOR repeated his prior assaults on power aspects of the Federal reclamation program. His general theme was that irrigation and reclamation are being subordinated to power. His premise seems to be that hydroelectric power as a function of water resource development is economically, financially, and politically adverse to the continuing welfare of the reclamation program. Curiously, he subsequently advances what he terms a solution to the problem, which involves inclusion of hydroelectric power.

I pointed out to Mr. Shamberger that in his letter Commissioner Dominy attempted to summarize my statements and, with the exception of the premise which he tries to establish for me, his reporting is generally accurate. I did not base my remarks on a view that "hydroelectric power as a function of water resource development is economically, financially, and politically adverse to the continuing welfare of the reclamation program." Such a premise would be contrary to my basic beliefs and to what I said. I made no such statement in my remarks, and I resent the inference left by the Commissioner. This distortion is a good example of what seems to be a complete failure to understand or recognize the problem. My basic premise was, and still is, that where hydropower is included as a function of any reclamation project, this power should be sold under prices and conditions which will help repay for the overall project and thereby assist the reclamation functions of the project and help pay the cost of water users. This is what I said to the National Reclamation Association Convention, and I repeat it now. The power pricing policies of Mr. Dominy's Bureau of Reclamation simply will not stand up under this premise.

Mr. Dominy went on to say:

In support of his premise, Mr. SAYLOR makes three principal points: (1) Annual revenues from power production do not equal or exceed annual costs, (2) inclusion of new high-cost hydroelectric power facilities with existing low-cost facilities postpones availability or irrigation assistance, and (3) our policy of retiring interest-bearing debt prior to the non-interest-bearing portion is poor business.

In making these points, he cites the Missouri River Basin project, the proposed Burns Creek addition of the southern Idaho system, and the dispute which took place over the addition of the Trinity River development of the Central Valley project.

In addition, Mr. SAYLOR asserts that it is bad to have many agencies involved in this field, the reclamation program itself is too restrictive, and it is bad to have reclamation restricted geographically.

I am in full agreement with two of Mr. SAYLOR's conclusions. I have often said that the present hodgepodge of Federal laws and

congressional committee jurisdictions creates competitive chaos in the water development field. I would much favor the elimination of overlapping and duplicating functions among agencies. I also would be much in favor of expanding the reclamation program to all 50 States. This would pose some problems in the handling of the reclamation fund, but these are not insurmountable.

The Commissioner's letter sets forth what he calls three principal points in support of the imagined premise which he attempts to establish for me. These three points involve questions of inadequate power revenues, adding of high-cost power facilities which postpone irrigation assistance, and retirement of interest-bearing debt first. These are points I made, the first two of which he evidently concedes, but they are still not the basis for my views. He also properly refers to my concern about the large number of Federal agencies in the water resources development field and the restriction of the reclamation program to the Western States. He seems to agree with both these points.

Accordingly, I am very much pleased to learn through these communications that the Commissioner agrees with at least four of the five points I made in Palm Springs. However, he seems to reach a different conclusion—which is really the fifth point—as to whether the conditions cited are beneficial to irrigation or are "poor business," as he describes it. I only wish he had admitted these facts publicly at the National Reclamation Association convention so they could have made their own decisions concerning whether the conditions now existing contribute to, or detract from, the advance of a sound and vigorous reclamation program.

Now, with reference to the detailed comments in Commissioner Dominy's letter, I would like to discuss them seriatim. Since he seems to agree there is need for improvement in the administrative structure of the Federal water resource development program and there is a need for extension of the basic reclamation program to the 50 States, he makes no rebuttal on these two points. But, the Commissioner continued:

I do not agree with Mr. Saylor's other conclusions. As long as the Federal policy is to develop western lands for irrigation and as long as the Federal policy is to require repayment without interest on the Federal funds used to develop the irrigation aspects of Federal projects, then there must be a way that these costs can be repaid. The development of hydroelectric power is one function of a multipurpose project which meets this need.

My letter to Mr. Shamberger commented on this point by pointing out that Mr. Dominy, however, does not agree with my other conclusions and advances a theory that as long as the Federal policy is to develop western lands for irrigation and to require repayment without interest of irrigation costs, there must be a way these costs can be repaid.

I am glad he puts the finger on Federal reclamation policy exactly where it belongs—on development of western lands for irrigation. Furthermore, that same Federal policy requires repayment of funds without interest expended to pro-

vide these facilities. It is assumed that repayment means a tangible return of moneys within periods which have some relation to the present worth of such returns. But, from this statement on, the conclusion he reaches seems rather specious and childish. It is typical of the "Never, Never Land" thinking that no matter what novel work someone proposes be built, it will be economically and financially feasible and justified. If this were true, we would be living in a dream world. Unfortunately, we are living in a much more pragmatic world. Many proposals conceived by Federal planners are not financially feasible and costs exceed amounts beneficiaries receive and are willing and able to pay. Just because the Federal Government has adopted a policy of developing western lands for irrigation does not mean that all costs of projects conceived by reclamation planners can be repaid in full. It is a complete nonsequitur.

The Commissioner said:

Consequently, we would not consider a proposed water development plan to have been well considered unless hydroelectric power benefits are considered along with all other water uses. Actually, it would be wasteful and we would be subject to criticism for wasting the publicly owned natural resources if we did not consider the place of power in any multiple-purpose project.

The development of hydroelectric power is one function of a multiple-purpose project which can be made to provide financial assistance for irrigation. Generally, however, this is not the case. Experience has shown that rates set for power by Government marketing agencies have been far from adequate to accomplish this purpose. They have often placed a burden on the project rather than assisting irrigation. Because of this widespread record, one can reach no other conclusion than that the policies applied in formulating and establishing such power rates generally were aimed at purposes other than securing maximum financial assistance to repayment of irrigation costs. Not even magical accounting and fanciful cost allocations can produce revenues to help reimburse irrigation costs from power systems that cannot support themselves. I strongly favor establishment of Federal power rates which can honestly aid in the development of economically justified irrigation.

Commissioner Dominy's comment on the need to consider hydroelectric power as one of the purposes of multiple-purpose water resource development is no rebuttal of anything I have said. If planning is to be comprehensive, and I am convinced that it should, all purposes should be considered. There is, however, a major question as to whether our mutual objective of making the best use of the Nation's resources can and will be achieved if the methods and procedures now used by the Bureau of Reclamation in justifying, building, and operating irrigation projects are continued. It is about time some commonsense was introduced into the standards, policies, and procedures used in these programs so that we do not further commit our resources to proposals which are not



only uneconomic, inefficient, and unfeasible financially, but also not in the best long-range interests of our country.

Mr. Dominy's letter picks up with the following point:

The statutes governing the reclamation program are evolutionary in character. At the present time these laws do not prescribe absolutely uniform standards among projects for the return of reimbursable costs. There has been, however, a trend requiring that all costs allocated to commercial power be repaid at interest within 50 years from the time power facilities become revenue producing and that costs allocated to irrigation be repaid within 50 years plus permissible development period after the associated irrigation facilities become benefit producing.

We are required to submit to the Congress in connection with our proposals for authorization of projects a showing of how we expect these reimbursable costs to be returned. The committees of Congress have insisted upon schedules showing how we would expect to accomplish repayment. Normally for projects involving hydroelectric power development these schedules and the accompanying testimony and reports of the Bureau have shown that in the early years of the project's life the annual revenues will be less than the annual costs. But as the project becomes operative and income rises, the annual revenues will exceed the annual costs and not only make up the deficit but in addition accomplish full repayment. It is our practice that to the extent annual costs exceed annual revenues in the early years the difference is added to the unpaid balance and becomes part of the interest bearing capital investment.

While it is true that statutes governing the reclamation program are evolutionary in character, conflicting forces have been operating in this field. There has been a trend, as the Commissioner indicates, toward firming the requirement that all costs allocated to commercial power be repaid with interest within 50 years and that irrigation costs be repaid without interest within 50 years plus a permissible development period where applicable. But, all too often, Federal power systems are not meeting this test and new proposals to dilute and liberalize these basic requirements in one way or another are continually being advanced. In several instances the reverse of what he states has actually happened. In fact, his letter is contradictory in itself. First, he states that normally revenues in the early years of a project's life are less than costs and during the later years revenues exceed costs to make up the deficit. This just has not happened in the Bonneville Power Administration area, for example; and I doubt that there are many places, if any, where this is happening.

The Commissioner then turned his attention to the Missouri River Basin:

The Bureau and the committees of Congress alike have realized for a number of years that the Missouri River Basin project was having financial difficulties due to increased construction and operation costs, adverse runoff conditions, changes in national policy, and other factors. Mr. SAYLOR recognizes that some steps have been taken to rectify these problems, but he did not choose to emphasize the major affirmative actions that have been taken by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department. He could have told the National Reclamation Association that the Secretary of the Interior has publicly announced his intention to promulgate a suitable increase in the rates for firm commercial power and that actions

of this character can hardly be called a preoccupation with power for power's sake.

To refer back to Hominy Dominy's letter, I wrote that now we look at the repayment difficulties in the Missouri River Basin which the Commissioner admits the Bureau and committees of Congress alike have recognized. Maybe I should have mentioned in Palm Springs, as he suggested, the steps he proposed to take in an attempt to present a better and more pleasing facade for the payout of this project. Maybe I should have told the National Reclamation Association convention that he planned in his new payout requirements to reduce—as of June 30, 1964—the rate of interest on all Corps of Engineers power investment costs in the Missouri River Basin from 3 to 2½ percent, even though yields on long-term Federal bonds—the real cost of money—had risen to 4¼ percent. At the same time, he proposes to continue the interest rate on Bureau of Reclamation power investments at 3 percent.

Why this favoritism for Corps of Engineers' projects? Is Corps of Engineers' money, which comes from exactly the same source through exactly the same procedure, actually cheaper money? Is the Bureau of Reclamation power any better? Does either rate of interest come anywhere near what the real cost of money is to the United States?

In testimony and reports by the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies in 1963 on S. 283, a bill which would amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act, it was stated that the interest rates should be determined on the basis of average market yields of long-term obligations of the United States. This would mean a rate for cost of money in 1964 of more than 4 percent. The General Counsel of the Treasury said that use of coupon interest rates as proposed in S. 283 "would reflect an average of Treasury borrowing over many years in the past, including the artificially low rates during the World War," and "to the extent that this coupon rate is lower than the rate reflecting market yields, a Federal subsidy is involved." The Treasury witness referred to the report of the President's Committee on Federal Credit Programs, dated February 11, 1963, which recommended use of market yields to measure the cost of Treasury borrowing and urged, that where subsidies are necessary, the subsidy element be explicitly recognized and disclosed. President Kennedy, in releasing the report, directed all agencies to be guided by it. Evidently this directive was not carried out in the proposed revision of the Missouri River Basin payout.

The latest GAO report on the Missouri River Basin presents a very lucid picture of operations on this project. In the "Summary of Findings and Recommendations" it says:

In recent years the estimated period of time required to repay the Treasury reimbursable construction costs from power revenues of the Missouri River Basin project has been increased significantly. As a result, no repayment of the non-interest-bearing construction cost subsidy to irrigation is expected to be made until fiscal year 2027 and full repayment of reimbursable construction

costs is not expected to be completed until fiscal year 2093. In addition, Bureau of Reclamation studies show that at June 30, 1959, no net repayment of construction costs had been made from power revenues of the Missouri River Basin project.

Existing legislation does not fix a specific period of time for repayment of reimbursable construction costs. In our opinion the Federal water resources development program could be more effectively administered if the Congress enacted legislation to provide policies and criteria for repayment of reimbursable construction costs of the Missouri River Basin project.

I went on to point out to Mr. Shamberger that in a report dated June 30, 1961, a special panel of consultants to the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the interest rate to be used in economic analysis should be in the area of 4 to 5 percent. This was at a time when yields on long-term Government bonds were 3.9 percent. I recognize that this recommendation had to do with the formulation and evaluation of projects; but, if the assumptions are valid for such purposes, they are equally appropriate for the operation and administration of this project.

I also might point out that Commissioner Dominy proposed that repayment of the irrigation share of the joint costs be deferred until the distant future when the specific irrigation facilities would supposedly be repaid from what may very well be on the basis of experience to date nonexistent surplus power revenues. In his payout study he properly indicated this was a major departure from the statutory requirements for the Colorado River storage project, for example, where all the cost of multiple-purpose storage reservoirs allocated to irrigation must be returned in 50 years. Why one region should be favored over another is not quite clear. If special subsidies are needed and justified for the Missouri River Basin development, then they should be specifically set forth and authorized by the Congress.

In his payout study the Commissioner proposed a one-fourth mill per kilowatt-hour increase in rates for eastern division marketable firm commercial power, but I have seen or heard nothing more about this token adjustment. Maybe it was intended as a temporary palliative never to be activated and used only to help gloss over the basic problem.

There are a number of other points in his 1963 Missouri River Basin payout study on which extensive comments could be made, but I will not go into all of them. The impressions the study left—that cost allocation by the separable-costs-remaining-benefits method and inclusion of interest during construction are new factors being included in the payout computation—is a complete deception. These factors have been used at least since 1954 in Missouri River Basin payout computations as indicated in his report, and have been the policy of the interagency committees at least since the late 1940's. Also, while the report states that part of the payout problem in the Missouri River Basin is adverse water supply conditions, this may be a common rather than a rare occurrence and what we well expect on the basis of



long-range averages. I am not so sure that those who predicted in the 1940's that Reclamation's estimates of average annual flow in this river were overly optimistic might not have been right. Reclamation has overestimated water-flow in other rivers in order to present a more favorable picture of payout than really could be expected. The same situation may well be present in the Missouri.

In short, the Missouri River Basin project is in financial trouble today because Mr. Dominy is today selling power from units of the project below its cost. For every kilowatt he sells from this project, the project loses money. The project is in financial trouble not because the Congress included hydropower as a functional part, but because the Bureau is pricing this power below its cost.

I am not alone in my impressions as to the chaos that exists in the Missouri River Basin project, or to my questioning whether power is really a paying partner. For example, the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in a speech on November 16, 1964, at Bismarck, N. Dak., said:

I doubt if many of you realize the extent of the criticism of the entire reclamation program as a result of problems caused by hasty and politically inspired actions, or the burdens placed upon those of us who are responsible for justifying the reclamation program in the Congress.

Development of the Missouri River Basin project as a single entity permits the use of power revenues to assist in paying irrigation costs. This is a sound conservation principle to which I thoroughly subscribe and which I have always supported. However, power revenues cannot assist irrigation development when power can't even pay its own way. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 11, 1965, pp. 479-483.)

I could not have made the point more succinctly. The reclamation mess is public knowledge all around the country. Even the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—who is the right arm of the President on program matters and is intimately familiar with agency activities—raised serious questions in an article in the January 9, 1965, Saturday Review of Literature—reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 7, 1965, pages 395-397—as to whether the reclamation program has been adequately adjusted to meet current needs. I hope he is not just whistling in the wind, and that his actions in future budgets will not only reflect this concern, but also indicate what steps he will take to remedy the situation.

Mr. Saylor dwells at some length on the effect of adding high-cost power projects to a going system. He considers this practice unreasonable. Such an operation is standard practice in almost every business that has a multitude of component factors resulting in one product which in turn is sold at one rate. Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago and in connection with the Burns Creek project, cited the case of an owner of a fleet of taxicabs. Senator CHURCH pointed out rightly that the owner of the fleet did not charge for taxi service in accordance with the cost of the operation of a particular cab but rather made a uniform charge based upon the average cost of all his cabs. Actually, of course, it is the regulatory agency

that finally sets the rate that cabs may charge, but the average cost is actually what is taken into account. All power utilities, be they investor-owned or publicly owned, follow this pattern. Consequently, it is difficult to understand why the Bureau of Reclamation should be criticized for following that which is common practice in industry. You can easily visualize the confusion were we to attempt to charge the multitude of customers power rates different for each powerplant in the system.

The Commissioner holds that the adding of higher cost projects is a good practice followed by industry. I would like to have someone explain to me how a power system which is losing money in the early years of its existence can actually keep the same rates, add higher cost plants, and still improve payout without juggling the accounts. A clear distinction must be made between a so-called high-cost plant and a high cost per unit of output. The claim that it is the practice of power utilities to add high-cost new projects to a system is not borne out by the facts. Rather, the existing practice and possibilities of adding new, larger, but more efficient plants to reduce costs is explained in detail in the recently issued national power survey of the Federal Power Commission. This report emphasizes the necessity that new plants have lower unit costs in order to bring down power rates. This fact explains why the electric power companies' rates have shown a consistently downward trend over the years even though other price levels have concurrently increased. The letter continues:

Power marketing in the Columbia River Basin area is not within the administrative purview of the Bureau of Reclamation, although revenues are obtained from this source to aid irrigation repayment. We will not discuss Mr. Saylor's reference to financial aspects of Federal power in that area other than to say that extensive studies are being made by the Bonneville Power Administration to determine whether existing rates are adequate to assure repayment of all reimbursable power costs within the legally imposed time limits and to contribute revenues for financial assistance as required to meet scheduled irrigation needs.

The Commissioner's letter said he would refrain from discussing the status of the Bonneville Power Administration payout except to mention that extensive studies are being made "to determine whether existing rates are adequate to assure repayment of all reimbursable power costs within the legally imposed time limits and to contribute revenues for financial assistance as required to meet scheduled irrigation needs." Studies on this subject have been underway for two decades; and, yet, for 7 straight years the deficits increased until 1964. Then, through use of what must have been answers to certain letters to Santa Claus, the amount of annual costs allocated to power was reduced by merely shifting a substantial portion of the cost to nonreimbursable navigation purposes and through other accounting subterfuge. In its annual report to the Congress in 1964, the General Accounting Office made the following comment on BPA payout:

The proposed reports contain our opinion that the financial statements, which were

prepared by the Bonneville Power Administration, do not present fairly the financial position and results of operations of the integrated power system. Our opinion was based on the fact that firm cost allocations had not been made for 9 of 12 projects in operation, the cost of generating project construction work in progress was omitted from the statement of financial condition, generating costs were not disclosed, and the effect of changes in accounting practices and the amounts to be repaid from power revenues were not properly disclosed.

Here the General Accounting Office says that the financial reports of a Government agency do not "fairly" reflect its financial position or operations. What an indictment of the operations of a Federal agency. How long would such conditions be permitted to exist for any non-Federal organization? Its officials would be promptly held to account for such situations.

In addition, is this not an excellent example of exactly the reverse of what the Commissioner said happens? Here the income during the early years of operation of low-cost, efficient plants created a surplus which was rapidly dissipated when new, more expensive, less efficient plants were added and no corresponding increase in rates was instituted.

Hominy Dominy continues:

Mr. Saylor cites the proposed Burns Creek project at some length. He reports accurately, as far as he goes, the repayment relationship between the Palisades project and the Burns Creek project. He fails to point out, however, that the annual revenues from power would be almost doubled by adding Burns Creek to the Palisades project, and that by extending the revenue accumulation period of the combined Palisades and Burns Creek projects beyond the year 2006 to the year 2028, the initial effect of Burns Creek in reducing temporarily the amount of power revenues available for financial assistance would be offset. Thereafter, the revenue accumulation which would be available for financial assistance to irrigation projects would be greater by over \$1,100,000 annually with Burns Creek project in the system than without it. This in itself counteracts the contention of Mr. Saylor as to the power-mindedness of the Bureau of Reclamation. Our objective is multiple-purpose utilization of our water resources, with consumptive use on farms and in cities of prime concern. But we cannot divorce these purposes and functions from hydroelectric power in large-scale projects.

I told Mr. Shamberger that I am glad to learn also that I reported accurately the repayment relationship between the Palisades project and the Burns Creek project. Sure, annual revenues might be doubled if Burns Creek was added to the Palisades system; but what would happen to annual costs—they would more than double. This cannot result in other than a detriment to payout and a reduction in the amount available for irrigation assistance. The Commissioner argues that revenues after payout of the two projects in the year 2028 would be greater, but the present worth of that money is peanuts. Furthermore, he overlooks the large amount of net income that would be realized after Palisades alone is paid out.

It seems to me that it should not take much of a mathematician, economist, or



financier to show that a project—Palisades—which would produce more than \$22 million surplus revenues between payout in 1988 and the year 2006, together with the net earnings from 2006 to 2028—and some estimates indicate this latter period to be 31 years, not 22 years—is worth much more than a larger project which might produce \$1.1 million more revenues annually after the year 2028. If the net earnings from Palisades were invested in Government bonds at the present 4 percent interest in the year 2006, and thereafter, they would be worth tens of millions of dollars in the year 2028 and would provide revenues double the surplus annual revenues of \$1.1 million which he claims from the combination project. If we really want to provide financial assistance to irrigation, let us do it in an aboveboard fashion and in a way which is perfectly clear and obvious and not by some sleight-of-hand manner which produces a fake and wrong answer.

My objective also is the same as that of Commissioner Dominy, "multiple-purpose utilization of our water resources with consumptive use on farms and cities of prime concern. But, we cannot divorce these purposes and functions from hydroelectric power in large-scale projects." But, we are not going to get it by embarking upon a course of constructing facilities which reduce and dissipate our ability to secure maximum economic development as the Burns Creek project obviously would.

NRA is, and should be, interested only in the dollar contribution the sale of power makes to the water features of any given project and not in whether the purchaser of the power is cooperative A, power company B, or municipality C.

Mr. Dominy continues:

The issue involved in the Trinity River division to which Mr. Saylor refers was whether or not the specific hydroelectric power facilities would be constructed and operated by the Federal Government or by an investor-owned private utility in a contractual relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation. The decision for Federal construction of the facilities was made by the Congress. The authorizing legislation for the Trinity River division directed the Secretary of the Interior to continue to conclusion negotiations with non-Federal agencies on proposals to purchase falling water and to report the results of such negotiations and his recommendations thereon. In February 1957, the Bureau of Reclamation reported on the offer of a private company to purchase falling water and then Secretary Seaton, in his report to the Congress later that month, recommended acceptance of the company's offer.

The Congress, however, did not pass legislation which would have authorized and directed the Secretary to enter into contracts as proposed by the private utility. Since the Congress had so declared its disapproval of the sale of falling water, appropriation of funds was made by the same Congress for construction of federally owned power facilities. The Congress itself thus dictated the course of action followed. Regardless of the merits of Federal versus private construction of the Trinity power facilities, Congressman Saylor used this case to support his main theme of Bureau of Reclamation dereliction in supporting irrigation interests whereas the Congress actually made the decision.

Quite aside from the politics of the Trinity River division, it should be remembered that the development is designed to import almost 1 million acre-feet of water into the Sacramento River Basin for eventual irrigation and municipal and industrial use throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. Moreover, the division will contribute a substantial block of pumping power for use in distributing the water southward and otherwise fulfill all of the promise that classic hydroelectric power development affords to the irrigation purpose. Revenue from the hydroelectric powerplants helps make this possible.

Mr. Speaker, in my letter to Mr. Shamberger, I said that Commissioner Dominy's comments, placing the blame for the Trinity River division power facilities on the Congress, came with rather poor grace. Even though various proposals for Trinity have been made for several decades, who—other than the Bureau of Reclamation—conceived, designed, and made the finding of feasibility on the project in 1952 upon which the Trinity authorizing legislation was based? Who—other than the Bureau of Reclamation—recommended in 1952 that it build the entire project including the much discussed power facilities? Granted, the 1955 congressional authorization for this project directed the Secretary of the Interior to continue negotiations with non-Federal agencies for the purchase of falling water and to report to the Congress subsequently did not concur in Secretary Seaton's recommendation for acceptance of the company's offer. The Congress only reverted back to what the Bureau of Reclamation initially recommended in 1952.

Furthermore, the issue in the Trinity project to which Mr. Dominy stated I referred is not the issue I raised in my Palm Springs statement. My point was not—and I repeat "not"—as he claims, "whether or not the specified hydroelectric power facilities would be constructed and operated by the Federal Government or by an investor-owned private utility in a contractual relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation." This issue had nothing to do with the question I was raising; namely, whether the power facilities—no matter who built them—would help to provide additional financial assistance to irrigation in the Central Valley project. While it is true that Congress authorized Federal construction of the Trinity project, it did not direct the Bureau of Reclamation to market power at rates which would lose millions of dollars that would otherwise be available to irrigation. The Bureau sets the rates not the Congress.

I was very much interested in the Commissioner's claim that the Trinity River division fulfills "all of the promise that classic hydroelectric power development affords to the irrigation purpose" and the "revenue from the hydroelectric powerplants helps make this possible," since power sold at present rates from the "classic hydroelectric project" has resulted in a substantial reduction in the Central Valley fund and has proved—as Secretary Seaton warned—to be "a drag and a drain" on reclamation. Secretary Seaton said the cost of Federal power from this project would be between 7½ and 9 mills per kilowatt-hour. CVP

rates result in about 4½ mills per kilowatt-hour. So the difference between 7½ mills cost and 4½ mills selling price is 3 mills lost—not a paying partner, but a sponging partner. I can only restate my complete agreement with my distinguished colleague from Colorado, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who said, "power revenues cannot assist irrigation development when power cannot even pay its own way." Even the Bureau of Reclamation cannot create surplus power revenues where there are none because the project is operating at a loss.

Commissioner Dominy really went out on a limb when he said:

We have been unable to reconstruct the computations by which Mr. Saylor arrived at the conclusion that the Bureau's appropriations for transmission lines and facilities amounted to more than \$57 million in fiscal year 1965. Regardless of the accuracy of that particular computation, however, it must be recognized that use of such statistics in any 1 year could be highly misleading, since our activities cover many types of construction. From 1 year to another the proportion of the funds expended may vary widely as these funds are expended on dams, powerplants, tunnels, canals, transmission lines, distribution systems, and many other forms of construction. One or two large contracts devoted to any specific purpose can materially affect the distribution of Reclamation's funds for the year of maximum earnings under those contracts.

I could not resist the opportunity to tell Mr. Shamberger that it should not have been too difficult for the Bureau of Reclamation staff to reconstruct the amount of \$57 million I said was appropriated for transmission lines and related facilities in fiscal year 1965 since this figure was developed from a press release from the Department of the Interior. In the Colorado River storage project and the Missouri River Basin alone more than \$40 million was provided. When the amounts for the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, and the Central Valley, Parker-Davis and other project transmission line and substation appropriations are added, I am sure the total \$57 million will be substantiated. Really, this figure is beside the point. The really key issue, however, is whether construction of Federal transmission lines are going to add to or take from the power revenues which will be available for reclamation. Whenever the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior advocate Federal construction of any transmission line, it seems to me NRA should be ready to ask not who is going to buy the power but for how much.

The Commissioner's letter continues:

The only way to make meaningful the type of comparison Mr. Saylor attempted is to base it upon the distribution of costs for completed projects. We have analyzed the allocations of estimated total construction costs on projects included in our fiscal year 1965 construction program. Of these costs, 32 percent are allocated to power, including in addition to transmission facilities all the powerplants, turbines, generators, penstocks, and other specific power costs, and a share of the costs of dams, reservoirs, and other joint works. The fact that about one-third of the cost of these projects is allocated to power is not insidious as Mr. Saylor im-

plies. On the contrary, the contribution of the power function to the financial feasibility of the irrigation function is paramount. In this group of projects it is expected that one-half of the cost allocated to irrigation will be repaid from power revenues. If such financial assistance were not available, hundreds of thousands of acres of productive lands on these projects could not have been irrigated. Without the assistance of power revenues, the reclamation program would not now enjoy its unique position among Federal agencies of being over 90 percent reimbursable and the enormous productive capacity of reclamation lands could have been realized only by outright subsidy from the taxpayers of the Nation running into billions of dollars.

This dramatically illustrates the basic wisdom of the body of reclamation law and of the administration of the program which provides for comprehensive, multiple-purpose development of the Nation's water and land resources into a balanced, flexible, long-range plan for increasing every phase of the regional and national economy.

I told Mr. Shamberger I realized such figures for any one year may be misleading; but the trend is clear. In a statement by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum during House hearings on the public works appropriation bill for 1965, it was stated that in 1963 "only about 33 percent of construction appropriations—for the Bureau of Reclamation—are for irrigation whereas 44 percent are for power. In other words, for every \$3 spent for irrigation in 1963, there were \$4 spent for power. This seems to be representative of recent years. So, neither is 1965 an unusual year. I ask, how can a program which spends 33 percent more money for power than it does for irrigation—particularly where most of such new power facilities create a burden rather than an assist on project payout—be called essentially a reclamation effort? Furthermore, while 90 percent of the reclamation program is supposed to be reimbursable, as the Commissioner indicates, the instances where payout has been made on schedule, without moratoriums or adjustment, are unique and infinitesimal.

There have been and still are outright subsidies from the taxpayers of the Nation running into billions of dollars, when the waiver of interest over extended periods is recognized. My criticism is not of the straight interest subsidy on justified irrigation projects; but of first, the rat-hole power projects which are leeches on power revenues, eating up income which could otherwise be effectively used to help repay irrigation costs, and second, the deceptive bookkeeping and reporting that is being done on many of these projects.

Mr. Dominy's letter goes on:

Mr. Saylor implies that the recently approved and initiated intertie plan through which surplus Columbia River Basin power will be delivered to markets in California and elsewhere in the Southwest will somehow or other hurt the Central Valley project and perhaps other irrigation projects elsewhere. He cites the fact that the Central Valley project budget request was used in fiscal year 1964 for initial appropriations as an indication that irrigators in the Central Valley will be required to underwrite or subsidize the intertie. A similar but untruthful reference is also made to the Bureau's region No. 3. These inferences are completely unwarranted. Central Valley project

was granted funds in prior years for study and construction purposes by the Congress as a simple matter of administrative convenience. Costs incurred through use of the funds have been transferred out of the Central Valley project accounts.

Future budget requests will be presented for the intertie as a specific item, and accounting and repayment administration of these facilities will be conducted as a separate accounting entity. Studies presented to the Congress earlier this year left no doubt that this activity will be completely self-liquidating. Thereafter surplus revenues conservatively estimated at \$114 million will have accumulated by the 75th year of operation. These revenues could well be made available as a source of financial assistance to reclamation projects in California, Arizona, and Nevada at the discretion of the Congress. These possibilities were brought out in the appropriation hearings.

I was very much interested in Mr. Dominy's statement that costs of the intertie have been transferred out of the Central Valley project. I would be interested in knowing, and I think the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees on the Congress should examine very carefully, where these costs have flown and what is the authority for the new accounting.

The Commissioner gets more defensive by saying:

Early in his presentation, Congressman Saylor accused us of wandering from our policies and programs: "... the career employees of the Bureau of Reclamation have wandered so far afield from the basic goal that it seems reclamation has become only of incidental importance." The policies, principles, and objectives of water resources development have undergone tremendous change since the reclamation program was initiated in 1902. We do not live in the past nor in a static or stagnant economy. To cling inflexibly to the past would be the death-knell of a progressive program. Rather than wandering from our policy and goals, we have been taking, and are constantly taking with the concurrence of the Congress, steps to keep pace with basic change occurring in our entire national life, and particularly in the field of natural resource conservation and use.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly for change where it is for the better. If there is any place in government where some new, sound, constructive thinking is needed and long overdue, it seems to me it is in the Bureau of Reclamation. The basic western settlement objective of the reclamation program has been largely achieved and is in need of modernization. Arrangements that have been repeatedly proven unsatisfactory should not be perpetuated but should be rejected or abandoned. Our limited natural resources should not be committed to purposes which may not prove to be in the best long-range interests of the Nation as a whole. We need broader and more objective thinking as to what is the best for all the people.

The last paragraph reads:

The Bureau of Reclamation appreciates the opportunity to present its views to your organization.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD E. DOMINY,  
Commissioner.

Thus ended Commissioner Dominy's letter. I concluded my letter to Mr. Shamberger assuring him that in every

reclamation project that comes before the Interior Committee in the future, I am going to insist that Commissioner Dominy's Bureau of Reclamation tell us just how much it will cost to produce the power and how much they are going to sell it for. I will try to write into every reclamation project authorization act a specific provision requiring that the Bureau of Reclamation fix a power rate which will guarantee that reclamation will receive financial assistance from power revenues. I will continue to do my best to make power truly a "paying partner" not a "sponging partner." I then told Mr. Shamberger I hope the National Reclamation Association will give its support.

Mr. Speaker, this whole question of Federal power marketing agencies setting artificially low rates for hydroelectric power regardless of the legal requirements is one to which the Congress can and must address itself. The repayment debacle in the Missouri River Basin is not the exception, it is the rule and is being repeated ad nauseam in other Federal projects. The Congress has displayed remarkable patience and tolerance in waiting for the power marketing agencies to clean up their own houses, but this patience should have reached the breaking point. Therefore, I am suggesting to the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that a special subcommittee be appointed to conduct a detailed study of this entire problem and report back to the full committee with specific recommendations for corrective action.

The adverse effects of Federal power not being a paying partner of reclamation does not apply only to the Western States. Since the Congress has assumed responsibility for assisting in the reclamation program, tax dollars collected from all over the Nation are being required to finance the program. My own constituents in Pennsylvania contribute heavily to aid their countrymen in the West, so they have a vital stake in whether the Federal power marketing agencies are fulfilling their responsibilities for making power a paying partner. This also holds true for the constituencies of every Member of this House. I do not believe we are keeping faith with those we represent and with honest reclamationists when we permit subsidized electric power users to sap the revenues from necessary water resource developments.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I will not rest in my determination to get the reclamation program back on the right track, and I call upon all my colleagues to join me in this resolve.

#### EVALUATION OF CONTRIBUTION OF EXISTING RECLAMATION AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS IN ALLEVIATION OF PROPERTY DAMAGE AND LOSS OF LIFE

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for January 14, I inserted the text of my letter to President Johnson calling for an evaluation of the contribution of existing reclamation and flood control projects in the alleviation of property damage and loss of life during the recent Northwest flood. I have been encouraged by preliminary responses to this request wherein Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineer estimates indicate individual projects preventing damages equal to or exceeding their costs of construction. This and other background information and study has led me to make further requests of the President. In view of major new considerations raised by this unprecedented flood and a reappraisal of our Federal responsibility, I have recommended first, an immediate speedup in watershed and river basin planning and feasibility study efforts; second, reconsideration of the cost allocation criteria for water control works applicable to flood control; and, third, a greatly accelerated and expanded national program of water resource development.

Finally, I have called for the President's direct leadership in the development and conservation of our great land and water resources. This I regard as urgently needed, for we need bold new plans to cut through the conflicts and inconsistencies of existing resource programs in order to face up to the mushrooming requirements of the Great Society.

The following is the full text of my letter to President Johnson:

FEBRUARY 11, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your concern for the plight of the disaster victims of the recent west coast flood is known and appreciated.

You will be interested in knowing that tragic as the losses have been, the threat of a recurrence of another major runoff this winter or spring is a real possibility.

While the action taken by the Federal Government on the immediate problem has been in many instances most praiseworthy, there have been many areas of indecision and inaction that have marred the record. In a separate letter which I have signed jointly with Senator MORSE, some of these shortcomings have been called to your attention.

As to the long-range problem, I have given serious study to an appraisal of our Federal responsibility to meet the major new considerations raised by this unprecedented flood and recommend to you the following actions:

First, I urge an immediate speedup in feasibility studies for watershed and river basin planning programs in the Pacific Northwest and throughout the Nation.

Second, I urge an immediate review of the criteria of feasibility and cost allocation for water projects, taking into full account the fact that the recent floods completely demolished the "highest flood of record" concept. This review should also encompass the criteria for the allocation of existing reservoir space and management as well as those pertinent to allocations at initial construction.

Third, I urge an accelerated schedule of project construction in those areas where recent floods have pointed up the complete inadequacy or lack of water control facilities. In this regard, engineers now admit that it is well within the range of possibility that should the same conditions that caused the recent floods recur throughout the Columbia River Basin the resulting disaster could be far beyond anything anticipated in present assumptions.

Finally, your leadership is greatly needed in the development and conservation of our great land and water resources. We need bold new plans to cut through the conflicts and inconsistencies of existing resource programs and face up to the mushrooming requirements of the Great Society.

I urge your immediate consideration of these matters that are of such vital concern to the future of our great Nation, and am available to you at any time for whatever help I can be in the furtherance of our mutual interests in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,  
Member of Congress.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Senate and General Assembly on January 18 and February 8, 1965, respectively, recommending an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to provide that no person shall be a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives who shall not when elected have been a resident of that State for 2 years prior to election to office.

This resolution is an expression of thinking representative of my State of New Jersey, and I am hopeful that other States will take similar action to convey the feeling of America's citizens in this matter:

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to provide that no person shall be a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election

(Introduced January 18, 1965, by Senator Sandman, without reference)

Whereas it appears desirable to provide in the Constitution of the United States additional residential requirements for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the General Assembly concurring):

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to take such action as may be required to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to provide that no person shall be a Senator

or a Member of the House of Representatives who shall not, when elected, have been a resident of that State for which or from which he shall be chosen for at least 2 years prior to such election.

2. That the secretary of the senate cause a duly attested copy of this resolution to be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of resolution adopted by the New Jersey Legislature.

HENRY H. PATTERSON,  
Secretary of the Senate.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF STRONGER WATER POLLUTION LAWS

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the frightening thought that future generations of our people might not even have enough clean water to drink let alone enjoy such activities as swimming and fishing has prompted me to introduce a bill today which will provide tighter government control in the area of water pollution.

The vital importance of waging a war against such water pollution was brought out by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union message. He summoned all of us to help beautify America and end the poisoning of our rivers.

I am introducing this bill only 2 days before the House Public Works Committee opens its hearings on water pollution. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, will chair those hearings. Because of his role in fighting water pollution, Mr. BLATNIK has been dubbed by colleagues in Congress as "Mr. Water Pollution Control." I would like to pay further tribute to Mr. BLATNIK's important cause by introducing a water pollution bill which is similar to his.

Unfortunately, the people of this Nation take their supply of unpolluted water for granted. It does not just happen. Water pollution does not stand still and without stronger Federal enforcement and control in the area of water pollution we face the very grim prospect of losing that battle.

As grave as it is in the Nation, water pollution is even a more serious problem in the central New Jersey area. In addition to being situated on the Atlantic Ocean, we have numerous other rivers, bays, and lakes in this region. As suburban dwellings increase, they produce an ever-increasing pollution problem.

#### FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the many captive nations now under the thumb of international communism becomes an increasingly important issue each day, for each day the Communists try to extend their power further. None of us can rest until these captive peoples have gained the freedom to select their own governments and to enjoy the blessings of liberty. So today, on this 47th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania, I extend a prayer that the Lithuanian people will soon be liberated from their present captivity and will again be a free and independent people.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following resolutions adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey on February 13, 1965, and by the Lithuanian-Americans of Kearny and Harrison, N.J., on February 14, 1965:

Whereas this year also marks the 25th year of Soviet occupation and subjugation of Lithuania and oppression and exploitation of Lithuanians residing in their homeland; and

Whereas during this past quarter of a century the Soviets have continuously strived to obtain recognition by the free world of their forcible seizure and annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and

Whereas our brother and sister Lithuanians in Lithuania are suffering under constant Soviet pressures to denationalize them and to russify and sovietize their country and their children: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved—*

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to firmly restate and vigorously promote in all diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania;

2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to urge the special committee of the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications" to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

3. To urge that Radio Free Europe extend its programming by including broadcasts in the Lithuanian language;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people presently suffering under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—total freedom and independence;

5. To support the policy of the U.S. Government, aimed at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and enduring peace, based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing within their own free and independent homelands; and

6. That we send this resolution to the President of the United States and copies thereof to the Secretary of State, our U.S. Senators and Members of Congress, and to the press.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,  
Chairman.  
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,  
Secretary.

We, Lithuanian-Americans of Kearny and Harrison, N.J., who are solemnly met here on this 14th day of February 1965, in Our Lady of Sorrows Lithuanian R.C. Church auditorium, Kearny, N.J., and who are loyal American citizens of Lithuanian origin, together with other American friends and sympathizers, have unanimously adopted the following resolution for consideration by the President of the United States of America.

#### RESOLUTION ON THE OCCASION OF THE 47TH COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Recalling the stand taken by the both great political parties of our country as expressed in their electoral platforms of 1964;

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania of a free exercise of the right to self-determination and of the respect for human rights and fundamental freedom: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved—*

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;

2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to urge the Special Committee of the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications," to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

3. To urge that the Free Europe Radio extend its program by including broadcasts in the Lithuanian language;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom; and

5. To support the policy of the U.S. Government, aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace, based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choice.

Rev. JOHN SCHARNUS,  
Pastor of Our Lady of Sorrows  
Lithuanian R.C. Church, Kearny,  
N.J.

PETER W. VELEVAS,  
Councilman, Kearny, N.J.  
JOHN J. SALVEST,  
Attorney at Law of New Jersey.

#### NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART VII

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues, part VII of the excellent series of articles

appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on "New York City in Crisis."

The following installment is from the January 28, 1965, edition of the Tribune and describes conditions in Harlem:

HARLEM DREAD: LEADERS' FLIGHT, GROWING DECAY

(By Barry Gottehrer and Claude Lewis)

(This is the greatest city in the world, but to an increasing number of its citizens it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Hundreds of these citizens have been telephoning and writing to the Herald Tribune since the investigative series "New York City in Crisis" began Monday. The tenor of their responses suggests that there is a hope that out of criticism can come renewed civic creativity, a meaningful reform that can permit people like the Alexander Jameses—whose story is told in today's article—to return to the city and live meaningful, satisfying lives.)

Godfred Cambridge, the talented Negro comedian, frequently tells the story of a Negro who, after years of struggling against prejudice and indifference, finally decides to break out of Harlem and move to the suburbs.

"Once this guy sees a few trees, some grass, and a clean street," the comedian says, "he becomes so white he has to take Negro lessons in order to communicate with his own brother he left behind in Harlem."

It is a funny story—one that invariably draws laughter from both whites and Negroes—but it is also a meaningful one. And at the heart of its meaning is a truth that threatens to turn Harlem's already troubled present into a nightmarish future.

Because of the city government's past indifference, present inadequacy, and future uncertainty in dealing with the worsening problems of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and its other ghettos, New York City's Negro middle class seems on the verge of giving up.

In increasing numbers, its members are deserting the slums that poison the mind as well as the body, the inferior schools, the rat-infested tenements, the prejudice and the corruption for suburbia—and, unfortunately in a great many instances, a whole new set of problems. Yet, to almost every single one of the 233,000 Negroes who live in central Harlem and to many of the 856,000 others, who live elsewhere in the city, a few trees, a few blades of grass, and a clean street would offer an immediate improvement.

"What was the point of remaining in the city when they made it so obvious that we weren't wanted?" asks Alexander James Jr., an electrical engineer who left the city for Middletown, N.J., last year. "There wasn't one sign, one indication that we were desirable citizens—and believe me, we looked. Somehow, it's not enough just to be tolerated."

Alexander James, Jr. is not a racist and he is not an outspoken civil rights leader. He is simply a 31-year-old New Yorker who learned that because he was Negro and because he wasn't rich he had to look elsewhere for a good life for himself and his family.

"Housing in Harlem is bad and the educational system is about the worst in the city," he says. "There's not much to keep the middle-income families in Harlem. The environment isn't generally conducive to high aspirations. That's the main reason people are moving away. I think it would be great if many more stayed, including myself, and worked for the good of the community, but we must consider our kids."

City hall officials and civic leaders constantly express concern over the loss of 800,000 middle-class whites and the influx of



more than 800,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans since 1950. They should be concerned. These are both critical problems—the loss of the productive young marrieds and the influx of the unskilled and semiskilled.

Yet these problems are, in a sense, certainly no more critical than the city's inability to keep the Negro middle class from fleeing New York. For without them—the doctors and the dentists, the teachers and the engineers—Harlem will be left with only the troubled people, who can't help themselves, and the politicians, who, in many cases, don't really want to help them either.

Even the respected leaders of the city's Negro community rarely live in Harlem any more. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL divides his time between Puerto Rico, Washington, and Europe. Prof. Kenneth Clark lives in Hastings on Hudson, N.Y. James Farmer lives in lower Manhattan. Whitney Young lives in New Rochelle. And Roy Wilkins lives in Queens.

To them—and the thousands of others who can afford to escape—Harlem might be an interesting place to visit but, they know, they'd never want to live there.

Never was the absence of a middle class so obvious as during the riots last summer. There were absentee leaders, there were rioters, there were looters, there were opportunists, and there were the little people with little or no communication among them.

The middle class, people intelligent enough to deal with the leaders, yet still not alien to the rioters and the little people, were sorely missed.

Where were they?

For the most part, they were in the suburbs or, unfortunately, like Ralph Ellison's "Invisible Man," taken to hiding as the easiest escape from the ugly reality in the streets outside.

"Sure I feel guilty—damn guilty," says one Negro journalist who moved to the suburbs 2 years ago. "But the real guilt is the city's. They're responsible for the slums, not me. Take yourself. You're white. What would you do if you were Negro? Would you want your family to live in Harlem?"

Take a good look at central Harlem—3½ square miles that spew out south to 110th Street, east to Third Avenue, northeast to the Harlem River, and west to the parks bordering St. Nicholas, Morningside and Manhattan Avenues and house 233,000 Negroes, 8,000 Puerto Ricans and nearly 1 million rats—and the answer for anyone who can afford better would have to be a firm "no."

It's not that Harlem doesn't have any decent people or any decent housing. It has both. But the decent housing is, almost entirely, limited to a group of relatively high-rent apartment houses (Lenox Terrace, for example, charges \$40 a room) and even these are insufficient. And the decent people are, for the most part, either unmarried and don't care or care deeply but aren't important enough to bring about radical change.

And what makes the present situation particularly depressing is that the decay, disorganization and dissatisfaction that envelops the buildings and the people of Harlem today are not merely signs of the sixties. Back in the late thirties, when Fiorello La Guardia swept in as mayor under a reform movement and long before the massive Puerto Rican influx further complicated the problem, Harlem was a troubled area—one in which the physical plant and the people were both in desperate need of help.

Today, despite the city's efforts to rid New York of slums, and 15 years and more than \$2.19 billion of urban renewal, the city's worst slum remains and, according to the people who can afford to leave and to those who can't, Harlem is worse than it ever was before.

"You can't just go in there and tear down all the buildings at one time," says Julius C. C. Edelstein, executive assistant to the mayor. "Where are you going to put all the people while you're rebuilding the area?"

So far—even in the face of the national war on poverty—the city, handicapped by limited funds and stymied by uncertainty, has done very little to prevent the increasing deterioration.

Why do people leave?

In the first place, there is almost no place to live. Of the 87,369 housing units in central Harlem, nearly half were built at the turn of the century and 90 percent were built before 1930. Eleven percent of the apartments are classified as "dilapidated" and 33 percent of the others as "deteriorating."

Overcrowded, inadequately heated and ventilated, with unsanitary toilet, kitchen and water facilities, a great many of these apartments have become breeding places for disease, rats, and crime. Particularly distressing and disturbing to parents is the area's infant mortality rate, judged by many doctors to be the best single index for measuring a community's health. In central Harlem, the infant mortality rate has been and continues to be shocking—nearly double the rate of the entire city (45.2 per 1,000 live births).

Alexander James, who grew up in the ghettos of Harlem and Brooklyn, knew he wanted to live elsewhere—almost anywhere else—when he returned from the Army in 1955. Despite a fairly stable home life (only half of the area's youths of 17 and under live with both parents, compared with 83 percent for the entire city), Alexander James knew what slum conditions could do. He had already seen too many of his teenage friends succumb to narcotics and crime.

"When I lived on Eighth Avenue and 114th Street, I could look out into the backyard and see any number of boys using drugs," he says. "And a lot of my friends got involved with the police for snatching pocket-books and holding up people. In Harlem almost every kind of crime takes place. After a while you don't even think about it because it's always there, all around you. I lived in ghettos most of my early life and the one thing that they have in common is that they never seem to change."

Even though he worked nights for the transit authority (he was going to school during the day) and his wife was a practical nurse, it was not easy finding a suitable apartment. It rarely is for a Negro.

In Negro neighborhoods, residents are victimized by slumlords. In predominantly white neighborhoods, Negroes are victimized by prejudice.

During a 5-week period in the fall of 1955, Mrs. James answered 10 classified ads for apartments in the Tremont area of the Bronx. In several instances, it was obvious that she had been turned down only because she was a Negro. Frequently the landlord would tell her that the apartment had just been rented. And when the place hadn't been rented, the landlord would claim that the newspaper had made a typographical error and that the rent wasn't really \$65 a month but \$110—or some other figure far out of her price range.

Now Dorothy James could have filed a complaint with the State commission against discrimination (renamed the State commission on human rights in 1962) and, after considerable redtape and considerable embarrassment, perhaps even won admittance into one of the houses. But like most people, the Jameses didn't want trouble, redtape, and embarrassment—they just wanted an apartment outside a slum.

The 11th ad she answered paid off handsomely—for the landlord. She found a small four-room apartment at 734 East 181st Street for only \$52.90 a month—plus an "initiation

fee" of \$925 for which she received no receipt.

"Every Negro family in that newly integrated area had to pay a similar fee," Mrs. James recalls. "We were just beginning our life together and we didn't want to start out in a slum. So for being Negro we had to pay an extra \$925. What we didn't know, of course, was that the only reason they let us into the neighborhood was because the place was already on the way down."

When more and more Negroes and Puerto Ricans began pouring into the area, the houses, the stores, and just about everything else seemed to go into a startling decline.

"It wasn't that the new residents tore them up but the whites moved out and all the services we enjoyed when we first moved in just deteriorated," she says. "I mean little things. Like they didn't clean the hallways as often as they did when the whites lived there. They stopped having quality food in the stores and they were not as courteous any more. Within a couple of years we realized that we had only exchanged a bad slum for a better one."

In 1961, when Alexander James graduated with honors from City College and went to work for Bell Laboratories in Manhattan, he and his wife, unhappy with their slum surroundings and crowded with two children in their small apartment, decided to move to a better community.

"Even though we could afford to live in the best apartment houses in Harlem, we never considered moving back," he says. "We were thinking of Westchester or Long Island. Then when I received word that I was going to be transferred to Bell's new plant in Holmdel, N.J., we welcomed the chance to leave the city. Harlem was definitely out of the question."

The factors that made it out of the question for the Jameses—and for thousands of other middle-class Negro families—all stem from the failure of the city, its people, and its government in comprehending and treating the disease of the slums. In addition to Harlem's decaying physical plant and infant-mortality rate, the Jameses also considered:

**Education:** The school system in central Harlem is so ineffectual that Negro students are already on the average of 1 year behind in word knowledge, reading comprehension and arithmetic by the time they reach the third grade, nearly 2 years behind by the time they reach the sixth and 2½ by the time they reach the eighth. And the dropout rate—from both academic and vocational high schools—is consistently above 50 percent.

"They have not been teaching the children of Harlem to read for 25 years," says Negro leader Bayard Rustin, "and they are still not teaching him to read now."

**Crime:** Violence and personal disorganization seem to be everywhere with little or no respect for the police who are viewed by many as part of all the corruption, the numbers, the gambling, the narcotics, and the prostitution that thrive seemingly unchecked in the area.

The area's juvenile delinquency rate is double the rate of the city, its habitual narcotics-user rate is from three to eight times greater, and its homicide rate is six times greater. And central Harlem's venereal disease rate for those under 21 is more than six times greater (110.3 cases per 10,000 compared to 17.2).

**Employment:** The median income is \$3,480 (compared to \$5,130 for whites) with half the families earning less than \$4,000 (compared to 25 percent for the city) and 17 percent earning less than \$2,000. Only 1 in 25 (compared to 4 in 25 for all the city) earns more than \$10,000.

Thirty-eight percent of the males hold unskilled jobs (26 percent for the city) and, despite approximately 1,617 business estab-

ishments in central Harlem, only 4 percent of the area's Negroes are managers and proprietors. For most Negroes, there is no opportunity at all for honest work in Harlem. Only 7 percent work at home or close enough to walk to work (compared to 17 percent for all of Manhattan).

**Indifference:** Despite the riots and the massive protests that followed, Harlem's residents realize they have won little from the city government—either in deeds or in understanding. To many, it seemed incredible but typical when the police department considered reassigning Lt. Thomas Gilligan, whose slaying of a Negro boy had triggered the riots, from Manhattan to Bedford-Stuyvesant, one of the city's two major Negro ghettos.

To city hall and "Whitey" downtown, these may seem to be relatively minor problems or, perhaps, symptoms of a greater ill—to be filed away at least until the weather turns warm again and forces the people of Harlem back into the streets.

But to the people of Harlem, these problems—and the city's inability to do anything to solve them—are of transcendent importance and growing increasingly more critical every day.

One of the Negroes who has not yet left for the suburbs is a 36-year-old lawyer named George Donald Covington who has been in Harlem since 1955. "There's a job to be done here," he says. "If every Negro moves away, who's going to help the little guy help himself? We have got to bring law and order to Harlem. We've got to make our young people respect the law and we've got to make the law respect our young people."

"Harlem isn't hopeless you know. But there is so much bitterness and anger here that it's hard to reach the people. They're angry over the little things. A Negro cannot give up nor can he ignore his people."

Mr. Covington's commitment is genuine but unusual. His law practice has been centered around Harlem for more than 7 years now and, between him and his architect wife, the Covingtons reportedly earn nearly \$20,000 a year. This enables him to escape the inadequate housing (by living in an old but well-kept, 6½-room, \$123-a-month apartment on 149th Street) and send his son to the Emerson School, a \$1,200-a-year private school on West 96th Street.

"I think more Negroes would stay and help see this thing through if the city gave them any reason at all to stay," he says. "But it doesn't. The problems of Harlem schools, like the problems of Harlem crime and Harlem housing and Harlem employment and Harlem opportunity, are all excessive because the city doesn't care enough to do its very best. And since the city doesn't care, neither do the people. Actually, it makes more sense to leave than to stay. The Negro is insulted everywhere he turns."

Civil rights leaders tend to agree with Mr. Covington. They have always had friendly relations with Mayor Wagner and, particularly in the aftermath of last summer's rioting, had little trouble in seeing him. Prodding the mayor into positive action has been another matter, however.

"You can spend 2 hours talking to him and come away thinking what a nice man he is," says one civil rights leader. "Then, when you get around to figuring out exactly what you've gained, you suddenly realize that he's given you nothing at all."

It is precisely this lack of responsive leadership in city hall—coupled with the increasing decay and the spreading blight—that has driven Alexander James and his wife and thousands of other Negroes out of the city. Today, earning slightly more than \$10,000 a year and living in a still partially furnished \$21,000 home as one of two Negro families in an otherwise all-white community, the Jameses have apparently been lost for good.

Their new life is far from ideal. Though not rent poor, there are economic hardships. They sorely need a second car but cannot afford to buy one.

Though normally friendly people, they have made friends slowly in the community.

Though they have been exposed to prejudice before, their two children had not. Their 7-year-old son is still troubled about being called "Swanee River" and "Chocolate Bar" by some of his classmates and told that "all Negroes carry knives and are bad."

"When we first moved here I was sorry because of the loneliness," says Mrs. James. "But now, every time I go to Harlem, I'm glad to get back home. We think New York has the potential to be a great place to live—even for Negroes. But it certainly isn't now and who knows if it ever will be?"

The Jameses have not yet found the need to take "Negro lessons" and probably never will. They are simply two people the city and the city's Negro community could ill afford to lose. And what makes their desertion and the desertion of so many others so tragic is that the city did absolutely nothing to keep them here.

#### APPOINTMENT OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

**Mr. ROSENTHAL.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

**Mr. MORRISON.** Mr. Speaker, the appointment of the Honorable John A. Gronouski for another term as Postmaster General was most pleasing to many of us. It has been my opportunity and privilege to work with General Gronouski on so many problems in connection with his Department. There is an article in the New York Times of February 16 entitled, "Gronouski Named to Another Term," together with another article, "Outspoken Postal Chief," which are most interesting, and read as follows:

**GRONOUSKI NAMED TO ANOTHER TERM—UNDER 1872 LAW, POSTAL HEAD SERVES A SPECIFIED TIME**

WASHINGTON, February 15.—The Cabinet hat on Postmaster General John A. Gronouski's head can lie easy for the next 4 years.

The White House announced today that President Johnson would nominate Mr. Gronouski for a full Presidential term.

Under a curious law enacted in 1872, the Postmaster General is the only one of the 10 Cabinet members who serves during the term of the President who names him and for 1 month thereafter, and then must be renominated.

Mr. Gronouski was appointed in 1963 by President Kennedy to succeed J. Edward Day, and continued in office under Mr. Johnson. Under the 1872 law, his term had 5 days to run.

This odd little historical quirk resulted from the Tenure of Office Act that Congress passed March 2, 1867, over Andrew Johnson's veto.

The act was intended to limit the President's powers. It provided that the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Interior, the Attorney General, and the Postmaster General hold their offices during the term of the President by whom they were appointed and for 1 month thereafter. The President could not remove officials without the approval of the Senate.

#### DISREGARDED ACT

Andrew Johnson disregarded the act and dismissed Lincoln's and his obstreperous Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, who insisted on merciless treatment of the vanquished South. This was one of the grounds for the impeachment proceedings brought against Johnson. Conviction failed by one vote of the two-thirds necessary.

Meantime, the provision of the Tenure of Office Act applying to Cabinet officers had been repealed a month before.

Post Office researchers discovered today that during the 1-year life of the act, a board of commissioners had worked out a new draft of the Postal Code to consolidate statutes relating to the Post Office Department.

That draft picked up the wording of the act, which said, "The term of the Postmaster General shall be for and during the term of the President by whom he is appointed, and for 1 month thereafter, unless sooner removed."

The new Postal Code, wording intact, was adopted as law on June 8, 1872, and there it has remained ever since.

"Somebody goofed," said a Post Office spokesman today. "Of course, whether it was a mistake or whether they wanted to limit the term of the Postmaster General is anybody's guess."

Mr. Gronouski must now await the likely confirmation of the Senate.

**OUTSPOKEN POSTAL CHIEF: JOHN AUSTIN GRONOUSKI, JR.**

The Postmaster General of the United States is a bulky, pipe-smoking extrovert who has disproved the adage that if a man speaks his mind frankly he won't get very far in life or in politics. John Austin Gronouski, Jr., who was 45 years old last October 26, has been an outspoken partisan Democrat all his adult life. Part of his reward was his Cabinet appointment 2 years ago by President Kennedy, an appointment that was renewed yesterday by President Johnson.

When the former college professor got word of his selection in 1963 he did not hesitate to acknowledge that he did not know his ZIP code and sometimes forgot to mail letters for his wife.

He said that the closest he had come to Post Office Department operations was licking stamps for John F. Kennedy's campaign in the bitter Wisconsin primary of 1960 and later in the general election.

In Washington he is acknowledged as a capable administrator of the sprawling postal operations. He arrives at his office in the Department's limousine between 9 and 10 a.m. and, unless he has a social engagement in the evening, stays until 7:30 or 8 at night.

#### A PAYCHECK ERROR

He is an informal type who is equally at home in smoke-filled academic seminars or smoke-filled political parleys. He is absentminded about such matters as getting his hair cut and has been known to work shoeless and in shirtsleeves in his Pennsylvania Avenue office.

Mr. Gronouski, the first Polish-American to receive a Cabinet appointment, was born in Dunbar, a hamlet of 106 people in northeastern Wisconsin. He explains the "U" rather than the traditional "W" in his last name by saying that his father had once received a paycheck made out that way and decided to change his name rather than waste the time correcting the error.

He grew up in Oshkosh where his father taught high school physics, and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1942. He flew 24 missions as an 8th Air Force navigator in World War II and now diplomatically declines to say whether any of them were directed at Poland.

Once he bailed out over the English Channel and survived even though his parachute



was on up side down. "I've been lucky all my life," he says.

He received his master's degree from the university in Madison in 1947, and, while writing his doctoral dissertation on "Valuation of Railroads for Ad Valorem Tax Purposes," taught economics and statistics for 2 years at the University of Maine and 3 years at Roosevelt University in Chicago. He received his Ph. D. degree in 1955 and taught public finances and banking at Wayne State University in Detroit until 1958.

In 1959 he won a civil service examination as research director of the Wisconsin State Tax Department and in the same year was named a tax commissioner by Gov. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. He held that post until his Cabinet appointment.

#### HELPED PARTY IN STATE

Although he has never run for public office, Mr. Gronouski played a leading role in the resurgence of the State's Democratic Party that began when Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER was elected in 1957 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

His advice was often sought, and frequently followed, by Mr. Nelson, Gov. John W. Reynolds, and Patrick J. Lucey, former Democratic State chairman.

In last year's campaign he spent his weekends corraling the Polish-American vote for President Johnson. His command of Polish, which he has learned through intensive courses since he went to Washington, was an acknowledged help.

Mr. Gronouski and his wife, the former Mary Louise Metz, of Madison, whom he married in 1949, live in a modest, two-story white brick house near Chevy Chase Circle, Washington. Their two daughters, Stacy, 12, and Julie Kay, 9, attend public schools.

The Gronouskis appear frequently at social events in the Capital. The Postmaster General drinks scotch at parties; with friends he likes to put his feet up and drink beer. Except for an occasional dip in a swimming pool, the extent of his athletic exertions has been checkers.

#### NAT (KING) COLE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, 13 days ago, I rose to pay tribute to a leading citizen of the 12th Illinois District whose death had left a vacant place against the sky. The Reverend Edward J. Coles, long-time spiritual leader in North Chicago, Ill., had passed on. I noted that missing from among his mourning family was a son—Nat "King" Cole, whose voice had made him internationally known in the world of entertainment.

Following my tribute here, I was one of the thousands who passed through the streets of North Chicago on February 7, 1965, and marked the city's flags flying at half-mast in respect to the lost leader. I was one of the hundreds who crowded into Shiloh Baptist Church, Waukegan, to hear and share in the expressions of respect, admiration and deep affection for Rev. Edward J. Coles.

Yesterday, Nat "King" Cole joined his parents—the father who had preceded him just 2 short weeks ago and the

mother who went ahead in 1955. His rich talent, his winsome personality, his exemplary life as a husband and father had endeared Nat "King" Cole so much that his final illness affected thousands. The staff of the hospital where his last days were spent reported an influx of mail and messages far beyond anything they had previously experienced. A half-million people had responded to the daily bulletins on radio and television or the columnists' stories of his illness and his postoperative progress. And when the end came, the story of his death crowded the news of a grim war off the front pages of some of the world's most influential newspapers.

There may be no flags at half-mast in North Chicago today, but there are aching hearts and fresh memories as we mourn for the beloved son of a beloved father. Perhaps there is an added voice to the "heavenly choir" of which poets speak, for somewhere Nat "King" Cole sings on.

#### TESTING THE ALLEGED GOOD WILL OF THE COMMUNIST LEADERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, again we hear throughout the land the chant that under the new leadership in the Soviet Union, the cold war is thawing. Communism is weakening its hold on its satellites and we are all getting closer together.

Today I am introducing a resolution which will put to the test the alleged good will of the Communist leaders. It would direct our representatives in the United Nations to bring before that world body the question of holding free elections in what has been termed the "captive nations."

These nations are Communist not by choice, but by force. They are not their own masters, but servants of the Kremlin. Their leaders are not self-chosen, but are puppets of Moscow. Their people are not free, but slaves beholden to a party which seeks to eliminate individuality. They do not have countries, they have subdivisions of the Communist Party.

These people have a history of pride in self and country. The world's music, literature, and history is enriched by the stirring works of these people, many of them refugees from the tyranny and abuse of communism.

Text of my bill follows:

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany,

Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over the aforesaid countries by force of arms; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the liberation question of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Albania, Cuba, and others before the United Nations and ask the United Nations to request the Soviets—

(1) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the aforesaid countries;

(2) to return all exiles and prisoners from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the United Nations conduct free elections in these countries under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against these nations.

Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has made a great show of seeking self-determination in the Congo. Apparently, only the so-called emerging nations have caught the interest of the U.N. in the field of self-determination. What about some of the oldest, most nationalist peoples, whose nations were entitled many years ago, but who have recently lost their freedom and national purpose when taken over by the Communists?

The Soviet Union has avoided the question of free elections in these nations. Why? Because the leaders in the Kremlin know that when men who seek freedom have the opportunity, they vote for freedom. Communism cannot convince. Communism rules by threat, fear, blackmail, force, and brutality.

A resolution seeking free elections for the captive nations should have the unqualified support of the new nations of the world who have entered the U.N. as free, self-determined countries. It should have the support of our allies, who have granted freedom to many former colonies, and who live in freedom themselves. In short, such a resolution should have the support of all but the purely Communist bloc.

If communism is the choice of the people of these captive nations, Red leaders have little to fear by holding free elections. The fact that they do not is testimony to the fact that they fear the outcome. Full discussion of the status of these nations would be beneficial. As the free world leader, the United States has the obligation to demand that the U.N. discuss this problem.

With new leadership in the Kremlin, with renewed claims of softening behind the Iron Curtain, now is the time to

bring to the fore the question of allowing people in the captive nations to vote their minds. I am hopeful that my colleagues will agree with me, and will help secure approval for my resolution.

#### SELMA INSCRIBES NOTE OF REASON IN HISTORY TEXT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Americans make sensible and logical conclusions on important public issues when they have the benefit of all the relevant facts. With regard to recent events in Selma, Ala., the relevant facts have not all been readily available for many Americans. With this in mind, I want to share with my colleagues a newspaper article which appeared January 31, 1965, in the Montgomery Advertiser. I urge its consideration:

CITY WRONGED: SELMA INSCRIBES NOTE OF REASON IN HISTORY TEXT

(By Don F. Wasson)

History is an image projected upon a screen through the telescope of time, which merges people, places, and events so that the reader gets the entire picture at one time.

Fifty, one hundred, or two hundred years from now, the events, places, and people of today will be but a paragraph in the history books and for all the toll, sweat, and tears expended by the generations of our time on earth, a paragraph is about all they will rate.

In the supercolossal, wide screen, vivid color drama now being acted out by today's cast of characters and called civil rights the name of one place called Selma might never appear in the finished product. It might well end on the cutting room floor, because the production will be long enough as it is.

But it would seem that if historians of the future were looking for a focal point upon which to base their postmortem conclusion as to who was right and who was wrong, what exactly did happen and what did not, then Selma, Ala., can offer a case study in the entire problem of the United States versus the people.

#### A DETERMINATION TO OBEY LAW

In Selma, you have a people who, nurtured on traditions as old as Selma itself, have resisted change with all their hearts and souls. They are a people who are conservative in their thoughts and actions and the forcible disruption of their traditions by an all-powerful Government has been a bitter pill to swallow.

But with determination, after last year's turmoil and strife, people in Selma had come to the conclusion that they would obey the law as best they could.

Mayor Joe Smitherman and Chief of Police Wilson Baker are the men who must lead the people through this difficult transition. As Baker told a civic club meeting recently: "This administration feels that it has a responsibility to lead Selma in dignity through the maze of legal transition resulting from the passage of the Civil Rights Act."

#### AN UNREASONABLE ATTITUDE

It appeared that the transition was going peaceably until early in January when Martin Luther King, spokesman for a large segment

of the Negro population, decided, in all his infinite wisdom, that Selma needed to be prodded into more rapid action in racial matters. So King, the prophet from Oslo, came into Selma and agitated the multitude. Full of ideas on how to get Negroes to register to vote, he marched them upon the courthouse and here is where the unreasonable attitude of the racial agitators comes into sharp focus.

The Dallas County Board of Registrars had requested, and had received approval of the State, to register voters for 10 additional days in January. Normally the board meets twice a month, on the first and third Mondays to accept voter applications. Records show that it can handle from 25 to 35 voter applicants at 1 day's session.

But Martin Luther King sends 150 or more down to the courthouse to register and they come back again, and again.

#### IN 6 DAYS, 35 APPEARED

Now any resident of Dallas County had ample reason to know that the voter registration time had been extended, but on the first 6 days the board was in session, only 35 prospective voters showed up. Of these, 20 were Negroes. These 20 Negroes received the applications without fuss, and, as far as can be determined, were registered.

So, with 4 days left, Martin Luther King herds his flock down to the courthouse. It seems that anyone with sense enough to pass the voter requirements would know that a three-man board couldn't register that many people in 4 days, even if they were all qualified.

Some of Martin Luther King's flock, once inside the registrar's office, indicated that they didn't really want to be there. There also appeared several Negroes who could neither read nor write.

#### REGISTERING, OR AGITATING?

So it would appear that King and his cohorts in CORE, SNICK, and other racial groups weren't really so interested in registering Negroes as voters as they were in agitating.

It seems from here that historians who write of our day and time are going to be lenient of the good people of Selma, and other southern cities who tried to do right but that they will be pretty rough on King and his cohorts whose goals always appear to be self-aggrandizement and agitation—keeping their reputations alive—as it were.

Selma's mention in the history books might well read: "In one city in Alabama, Selma in Dallas County, the white people tried to meet the demands of the times as dictated by the Federal courts with reasonableness, but it was not allowed by the racial agitators."

#### THE INVADING HORDE

And in passing, we might also condemn a large segment of the national press, those publications who feed on sensationalism and half-truths, for sending into Selma a horde of semiliterate newsmen who, without feeling for the hard-working and God-fearing people, send back stories which distort the facts or, worse, disregard the facts completely.

You can read in countless publications how the great and noble King was punched in the face in Selma, Ala., without ever reading that the man who punched the Negro leader was not a Selman. Was not, in fact, a native Alabamian.

You can read how a law officer subdued a Negro woman who was standing in the voter line without ever knowing that she shouted obscenities at him beforehand. You can read how a law officer insisted that the Negroes use a certain door to enter the courthouse without ever seeing an explanation that a crowd of this size would completely block the main entrance and put a stop to normal business conducted in other courthouse offices.

#### BEATNIKS, UNLIMITED

Many of these so-called newsmen turn up at every scene of racial unrest. A good many of them seem to have been swept from the expresso houses and their knowledge of the history and traditions of the South is totally nonexistent. Yet they come down dressed in unpressed clothes and superior attitudes and sniff around for trouble. They see King get hit and this is all they need. The wires to New York and other centers of culture are kept hot with their unmitigated trash, their half-truths, and fabrications.

We have warred with the northern and liberal press before and we shall again. But the indictment of history shall weigh far more heavily upon the heads of these publishers than it shall upon the good people of Selma.

These good people are to be commended for their forbearance under circumstances no outsider can ever fully appreciate. And we say to them, "Hold fast to reason, for it surely shall prevail in the light of history."

#### CLEVELAND BILL TO PROTECT FULL SERVICE TO VETERANS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation in an effort to restore order in the handling of the Veterans' Administration and insure that full service to our veterans is maintained throughout the country.

This bill would require that at least one veterans service center be located in each State and that the Veterans' Administration must give at least 180 days' notice to the public and the Congress before closing, reducing, or relocating any of its hospitals or other service centers. It also provides that public hearings must be held when requested by veterans in each congressional district where changes of this sort are proposed.

This legislation is in direct response to the shocking mishandling by the Veterans' Administration of its recent proposal to reduce, eliminate, or relocate a variety of hospitals and regional offices across the country. These plans were drafted, completed, and announced without any notice to Congress or any prior consultation. Although done in the name of economy, no economy has been satisfactorily demonstrated. In fact, this year's Federal budget request from the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year carries requests for new hospital facilities costing an estimated total of \$113 million, or about five times the amount the VA claims will be saved by the closings and reductions it has announced.

The provision that each State have a veterans' service center is simply to insure that services will not be pulled into the great urban centers in the name of efficiency and economy. The planned curtailment of VA regional offices serving New Hampshire, those in White River Junction, Vt., and Manchester, N.H., and the consequent expansion of the VA office



in Boston, cannot but harm those veterans who live far from Boston. This applies especially to those who are sick, old, and poor. From most of our areas, there is not even passenger train service to Boston. Indeed, such passenger service as we do have in New Hampshire is now threatened by extinction in proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Although my immediate concern is for fair treatment of veterans, there is a deeper issue involved. That is the disturbing trend toward centralization in this country that, in my opinion, directly threatens our freedom. The centralization of political power in Washington continues unabated. Local and State governments are being bypassed by new Federal programs. Small States, small communities, small businesses, and individuals are being bypassed. As Government gets ever bigger, it becomes increasingly difficult for the individual to assert his rights, and only big power groups are able to have their voice heard. If, for no other reason than this, I feel it is imperative that Congress reassert our basic conviction and belief that the small communities and small States are still important and their voice still entitled to respectful attention.

My bill would make certain that each State would have at least one veterans' service center and would make certain that full service is readily available so long as there are veterans needing them.

This country made a commitment to our veterans years ago—a commitment that must be honored. We must not allow it to be whittled away by an autocratic bureaucracy. It is clearly necessary for Congress to step into this situation and do so promptly. I take this opportunity to ask for speedy consideration of this bill in committee and on the floor of the House.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the unenviable lot of the Lithuanian people in their own homeland for more than two decades has been to exist under an oppressive and arbitrary Communist dictatorship.

These people had known the callous cruelty of Russia's czarist regime for more than 100 years, but during that time they had found it possible at times to defy and flout the authority of their overlords, and if they found it difficult to endure the czarist yoke, then they could easily emigrate to another country. Thousands and perhaps tens of thousands of Lithuanians left their homes and settled in other countries, many of them coming to these United States.

Early in 1918, the Lithuanians were freed from the czarist autocracy and

proclaimed their independence. On February 16 of that year they founded their republic. For a little more than two decades, during the interwar years, they worked, lived, and enjoyed their freedom there. And then in the course of a few months after the outbreak of World War II, they found their freedom and independence threatened. Their country fell under attack by the Red army, was occupied, and eventually made part of the Soviet Union in mid-1940.

The catastrophe that had fallen to Lithuania was not unique, for a number of other independent nations had also been robbed of their freedom by the Red army, but the Lithuanians had the misfortune of being among the Kremlin's early victims. Since then they have been sealed off in their homeland, behind the Iron Curtain, and there they do not even have the freedom of movement, the freedom to get away from their oppressors. On the 47th anniversary of their independence day let us all pray for their deliverance from Communist dictatorial tyranny.

As we mark their independence day today, I ask the Members of Congress to act favorably upon legislation which would bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations and resolve that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

I have introduced such a measure, House Concurrent Resolution 26, the text of which is as follows:

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, (b) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision.

#### FREEDOM FOR COSSACKIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Don Cossacks declared their independence, but these valiant people were subjugated by the Red armies, as were the Kuban Cossacks who proclaimed their freedom on May 5, 1918, in the second step toward the creation of Cossackia.

The concept of an independent Cossack nation is an old one which can be found in the history of the 18th century. It is a subject which is deserving of considerable study by Americans interested in the national groups now forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The Cossacks, whose traditions of self-government and nationalism are well known, were among the most courageous fighters against Russian imperialism. In one of the greatest tragedies of postwar history, the whole Cossack military force, along with wives and children, was massacred by the Russians. Thus, the Cossack nation has been partly annihilated by Soviet might, but the brave Cossacks who survive are still defiant of Communist attempts to obliterate them as a separate people.

It is just such examples of imperialist totalitarian slavery as the cruel treatment inflicted on the Cossacks by the Soviet Union that make it so imperative that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be established in this session of Congress to assemble and publicize the truth about the captive nations. In this way we in the Congress can give concrete evidence of our vigorous support of freedom for Cossackia and other captive peoples who are now the victims of the international Communist conspiracy.

#### THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, that brave nation which has suffered under Russian domination for so many years but whose people have never ceased to strive for freedom.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people, after 123 years of occupation by czarist Russian forces, declared their independence and instituted a democratic republic which flourished for 22 years before they were again cruelly oppressed by the Communists and Lithuania was made part of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress should take positive action to show the courageous people of Lithuania that we support their yearning for independence. Again this session I have introduced a resolution requesting the President of

the United States to instruct our Ambassador to the United Nations to place the Baltic States question on the U.N. agenda and to have the United Nations request the Soviets to withdraw their troops and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This resolution would also call upon the U.N. to conduct and supervise free elections in these three Baltic nations so that the historic principle of self-determination of peoples would be legitimately applied there. I urge this resolution be acted upon during this session.

Another meaningful action which could be taken by the House of Representatives would be the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. This would be an effective instrument to expose to the world the hypocrisy of Soviet colonialism and tyranny and to mobilize world opinion in support of the aspirations of the captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Lithuanians who persevere in their determination to regain their liberty, the Lithuanian-Americans who are so active in the fine work of the anti-Communist exile groups from the captive nations, and the many supporters of Lithuanian freedom in observing this anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is my fervent hope that the Lithuanians' desire for freedom will soon become a reality.

#### THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1965, we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. We mark this date in the Halls of Congress because the people of Lithuania are not free to celebrate it. We mark it because there is a living link between the United States and Lithuania formed by the many Americans who immigrated here, or whose forefathers immigrated here, from that Baltic nation. Finally, we mark it to remind all peoples stifling under Communist domination that they have not been forgotten by the free world and to fortify their hope that they will someday live in freedom again.

For a century and a half prior to its declaration of independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuania had been subjugated to Russia. During this era the czars attempted to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with those of Russia, but the Lithuanian people steadfastly resisted. They never forgot the joys of freedom nor lost sight of their goal of regaining their freedom. We can be confident that the Lithuanian people have not changed and the new period of

domination by Russia, which began in 1940, has not extinguished their determination to live as freemen.

The Lithuanian people have a long and noble history from which they can draw strength and inspiration in these dark days when they must endure the tribulation of Communist rule. They can trace their lineage back to the Middle Ages when they established a powerful and independent state. They can remember the happy days between the two world wars when Lithuania was a member of the League of Nations and its sovereignty was recognized even by the Soviet Union. They can take pride in their distinctive folklore, culture, and language which no foreign rule can destroy.

In conclusion, I wish to join in marking the 47th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day. May the Lithuanian people, through their contacts with our people of Lithuanian background and through the continued strengthening of freedom throughout the world, maintain their faith in freedom throughout the dismal period that they cannot practice it.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
February 16, 1965.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate John A. Roberts, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III, of the House.

Respectfully yours,  
RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. ROSENTHAL), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENTON and to include a speech by Senator HARTKE.

Mr. MULDER.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. STANTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BELL.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROSENTHAL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

582. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 83-163; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

583. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize revised procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

584. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203(j); and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203(k), pursuant to section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

585. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application for a loan by the Nevada Irrigation District of Grass Valley, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, pursuant to section 4(c) of the act (71 Stat. 48); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

586. A letter from the chairman of the board, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting a report of the Communications Satellite Corp. for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 404(b) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

587. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation relative to the claim of the port of Portland, Oreg., against the United States, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 236; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

588. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report for calendar year 1964 relative to the advisory committees which assist the Secretary in carrying out any of his functions under the Social Security Act; and pursuant to Public Law 87-543; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 2208. A bill to modify the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 4606. A bill to modify the flood control project for Four River Basins, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 48. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 233. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2998, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 234. Resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 45, a bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4934. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port, or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4935. A bill to provide that dependent parents may be covered by a health benefits plan under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction, for income tax purposes, based on expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the higher education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4937. A bill to provide Federal assistance for programs of research and experimentation in crime prevention and detection, and for the training of law enforcement personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4938. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4939. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program service shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4940. A bill to provide research, technical and financial assistance with respect to the disposal of solid wastes to the several States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4941. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4942. A bill to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4943. A bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4944. A bill relating to the status of volunteer fire companies for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and for certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4945. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to give the States the right of appeal from certain administrative decisions made in connection with grant programs under such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to permit the use of foreign currencies accruing from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities in foreign countries having a Communist government to be used to make farm improvement loans to private enterprise farmers in those countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer with adjusted gross income of \$7,500 or less a deduction for the expenses of tuition and certain other fees and charges paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an insured individual 50 years of age or older shall be eligible for old-age insurance benefits if he loses his job (and cannot obtain another one that is comparable) by reason of automation, relocation, reduction, or other causes beyond his control; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4950. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 4951. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4952. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to eliminate literacy tests as a qualification for voting in any election, to facilitate voting registration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in

preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4954. A bill to designate the Allegheny River Dam and Reservoir on the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the accounts of nonresident aliens not engaged in business in the United States to provide parity of treatment for deposits with persons carrying on the banking business and savings accounts with domestic building and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4956. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4958. A bill to permit the State of Pennsylvania to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 4959. A bill to amend the Hatch Political Activities Act with respect to the political activities of certain Federal and State employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4960. A bill to establish a land use study; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4961. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 4962. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of an Aircraft Noise and Pollution Control Service within the Federal Aviation Agency and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4963. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 4964. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4965. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4966. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4967. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4968. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4969. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4970. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 4971. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 4972. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4973. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4974. A bill to amend section 4001 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe qualifications for members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any 5-year level premium term plan policy of national service life insurance shall be deemed paid when premiums paid in, less dividends, equal the amount of the policy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4976. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4977. A bill relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4978. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize additional funds to be available exclusively for disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4979. A bill to permit any wage earner to defer payment of a portion of the difference between the income tax imposed for a taxable year beginning in 1964 and the amount deducted and withheld upon his wages during 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on

admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4981. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to liberalize the Federal-State programs of health care for the aged by authorizing any State to provide medical assistance for the aged to individuals eligible therefor (and assist in providing health care for other aged individuals) under voluntary private health insurance plans, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives to encourage prepayment health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution to provide for a White House conference on crime prevention and juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify its provisions insofar as they relate to the making of laws permitting the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to designate Monday, October 4, 1965, as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to present before the United Nations the question of the enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia with a view to obtaining their independence and the return of their peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RACE:

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States

to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 235. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 1st session of the 89th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H. Res. 236. Resolution to set national policies for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 237. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 112; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 238. Resolution expressing the sense of the House against the persecution of persons by Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

45. Mr. OLSEN of Montana presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana requesting the amendment of 34 Statutes at Large 1416, codified as title 45, United States Code, section 62, relating to the hours which employees of railroads may be required to work, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Rammurt Mishra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Jose Augusto Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Rodamandi Kokolis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Leonidas Athanasakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 4986. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abdurrahman Nagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4987. A bill for the relief of Jose Edmundo Bentencourt Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4988. A bill for the relief of Theodore Panagiotacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4989. A bill to award a Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to the late Stewart Holland; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4990. A bill for the relief of Francisco Campos-Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4991. A bill for the relief of Rubena Unice Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4992. A bill for the relief of Vito Giammona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Lem Buck You, Lem Soo Ying, and Lem Stanley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4994. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 4995. A bill for the relief of Muhammad Sarwar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Hristos Papadopoulos (also known as Christos Papadopoulos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4997. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lacertosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Frances von Wedel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4999. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Army Spence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Goldford Eleaza Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5002. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Wong) Wolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Joseph Benrubi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Padin Kilgour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5007. A bill for the relief of Arley L. Beem, aviation electrician's mate chief, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5009. A bill for the relief of Horace H. Easterday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5010. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Jorge Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5011. A bill for the relief of Mirjana Tomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the flow of history, esteem is due less to nations with abundant military power and rich in material goods, than to those which struggle courageously and determinedly for their own and others' rights to freedom and to a better future. And it is especially today, when the Soviet-imposed Red regimes are holding millions in slavery and openly seeking to impose their colonial rule on other nations, that the freedom struggle of the small Lithuanian nation acquires particular meaning.

It was in 1918 that Lithuanian independence was achieved. Yet freedom had but a short day in Lithuania; In 1940 the country was again seized by the Russian Bolsheviks, underwent a 3-year occupation by Hitler, and has remained in the Soviet colonial prison camp ever since. On the day Lithuania's freedom was throttled, the population again girded itself for a long period of resistance.

The freedom fight has cost the Lithuanian people many lives, but at the same time it has strengthened their determination to uphold their national culture and traditions, and to insist on their right to choose their own political, economic, and social institutions. By its cultural values, its faith, and its world view, Lithuania continues to belong to the West and exemplifies Western man's readiness to defend spiritual freedom, the principles of democracy, and fundamental human rights.

The Lithuanian resistance did not falter during the first Soviet Russian occupation, nor did it falter when the Russians were replaced by the Nazis in June 1941. The strength of the Lithuanian people, so courageously displayed during the German occupation, is as evident today when once again they find themselves the victims of Russian oppression.

The late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, believed, as I do, that Lithuania's freedom is the concern of all humanity.

He expressed this more eloquently than I might when he said:

Together we must work to strengthen the spirit of those Europeans who are not free, to reestablish their old ties to freedom and the West, so that their desire for liberty and sense of nationhood will survive for future expression. We ask those who would be our adversaries to understand that in our relations with them we will not bargain one nation's interest against another's and that the commitment to the cause of freedom is common to us all.

All of us \* \* \* must be faithful to our conviction that peace in Europe can never be complete until everywhere in Europe men can choose, in peace and freedom, how their countries shall be governed \* \* \*.

### Kosciuszko and Lincoln—Fighters for Freedom and Democracy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we celebrated the 219th anniversary of a great Polish fighter and

advocate for liberty and human rights, Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a stranger to this country, inspired by a fervent love of freedom and liberty, came here on borrowed money to offer his services to our new Nation in the American Revolution to help gain our freedom and independence. His brilliant service in the American Revolutionary Army caught the attention of George Washington, who placed him in charge of the building of the West Point fortifications. There a monument stands erected to his memory by the American youth as a tribute to his leadership and heroism.

Upon returning to Poland in 1792, he led a tiny, but inspired, army in its heroic resistance against the Russian tyrant. Upon the unsuccessful termination of that insurrection he again came to the United States, which he called his second country, and for which he declared his love and affection.

By a strange and historic coincidence the 12th day of February is also the anniversary of the birth of another great citizen of the world, Abraham Lincoln.

Though they were born nearly a century apart, though one was a Pole and the other an American, one a soldier, and the other a statesman, they had many characteristics in common which would place them in the same category in the annals of American history.

Both of them had a fervent love for freedom and the ideals of democracy. Kosciuszko fought to give birth to this great Nation of ours and Lincoln made every effort during his time to keep it intact. Both contributed richly to make this Nation great. Both believed in the dignity of man. Both of them dedicated their lives to free men from oppression.

This Nation, and the world today, is sorely in need of the inspiration and leadership of great men like Kosciuszko and Lincoln.

In Lincoln's day half of our Nation was enslaved. Today half of the world is enslaved, and the fate of our entire civilization is at stake.

Our great American Nation has never shirked its responsibilities. It has never given in to a tyrant or aggressor, and, God grant it, will not do so today.

I hope we bear in mind that while we here enjoy the blessings of freedom, the native land of Kosciuszko, who fought and sacrificed to make our land free, still suffers together with the lands of many other peoples under the yoke of tyranny.

In honor of the memory of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, therefore, and in order to preserve for our children that freedom here which we hold so dearly, let us dedicate ourselves to a firm determination to make this country and the entire world safe for democracy, the democracy for which Kosciuszko and Lincoln fought so bravely.

### Lithuanian Independence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 16, 1965*

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this day commemorating the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to a nation that has lost the most precious possession a nation-state can hold; namely, its freedom.

During the interwar period, Lithuania took its place proudly in the family of nations. It established diplomatic relations with the nations of the world. It was an active member of the League of Nations. In every way, Lithuania sought to fulfill its obligations to international society as an independent nation-state.

The same can be said for internal Lithuanian affairs. Lithuania had prospered economically, culturally, and socially. Lithuanians could be justly proud of their national achievements during this period.

The point I am trying to make is simply this: By every objective criterion Lithuania proved her capacity to play a fit and honorable role in international life; Lithuania had fulfilled all the requirements humanity expects of a modern state. The Soviet conquest of Lithuania was, therefore, as senseless as it was cruel. There was no justification for this horrendous act of inhumanity and the oppression that has existed in the country since that time. The rationale for the Soviet conquest stems from a deep-rooted Soviet ideological commitment to expand communism. For this reason, the fate of Lithuania is a warning to all men of the free world who cherish their liberty.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I add my voice with all others in praising the fortitude and perseverance, the nobility and resolve of the long-suffering Lithuanian people. And to them I extend my warmest con-

gratulations on this their day of national dedication and express the hope that freedom will one day be theirs.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 16, 1965*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War I many oppressed national groups regained their independence. The Lithuanian people, one of the three Baltic nationalities suffering under czarist Russian rule, declared their independence on February 16, 1918.

The Lithuanians have a distinct place in the history of northeastern Europe. They are the most numerous of the three Baltic peoples and they have always been sturdy defenders of liberty. Although they have borne the heavy yoke of the Russian Government for more than a century, they have managed always to keep their love of liberty and their patriotism alive.

Both in the attainment of their Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance during more than two decades, I am happy to say, the United States made important contributions. The Lithuanians received great encouragement from the famous 14 points of our late President Wilson. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for independence had the support of the people and Government of this great Republic.

In 1918 when the Lithuanian people earned their freedom they and their friends everywhere thought that their servitude and misery under alien rule had come to an end. This brave people who had struggled against Teutonic Knights in the 13th and 14th centuries, against their Polish overlords through the next four centuries, and finally against the regime of the Russian czars for more than 100 years, had at last broken the chains of their bondage. A new day had dawned for them, and a new promising life began for them as a nation. During the 20-odd years of their independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuanians were quite content with their lot. Since the outbreak of the last war fate has been unkind to them.

Early in that war they lost their freedom and independence. Lithuania was attacked and occupied by the Red Army early in 1940, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Then during the war it was overrun by the Nazis and held by them for some 2 years. Toward the end of the war Communist Russians returned and they have been there for more than 20 years. They have been treating Lithuanians more cruelly, and have imposed upon them a harsher regime than did the Russian czars, and today the Lithuanians are oppressed under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland. Although they are not al-

lowed to celebrate their national holiday there, we as their friends and sympathizers, observe the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and thus echo their patriotic sentiments.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 16, 1965*

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, after more than 125 years of virtual slavery, a nation was reborn on the distant shores of the Baltic Sea. That nation was Lithuania. Today we celebrate that memorable day, 47 years ago, when independence came once again to these people in Lithuania, but even as we celebrate her independence, she is no longer free. We speak, here today on the floor of Congress, of the greatness of Lithuania, but her own people in that land which is no longer independent, can only whisper the message of freedom to their children so that the dream of independence may someday come alive.

Two and a half centuries before Columbus discovered America, Lithuania was a united kingdom under King Mindaugas. She was a great power, indeed one of the greatest powers, in eastern Europe until the 16th century, when Poland and Lithuania were joined by marriage under a Lithuanian King. Her history from that moment was inevitably tied to the history of Poland. In the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence, Lithuania became another state that lay under the power of the czar. For more than a century Lithuanians fought desperately to keep their own civilization alive. For more than a century Lithuanians prepared for the moment when they would be free again. In 1918 that moment came and on February 16 of that year Lithuania again joined the roster of the nations of the world. For just over 20 years Lithuania worked and grew as a bastion of freedom and culture in the north of Europe. Then in 1940 a cynical alliance was formed between nazism and communism and the troops of Stalin trampled Lithuanian freedom into the dust as they marched across the land. A year later the unholy alliance between Hitler and Stalin had dissolved and Lithuania was occupied by Nazi troops as they marched eastward. Three years later the same Nazi troops were driven from the land and Stalin once more occupied this country.

The late Winston Churchill, in one of his memorable speeches, spoke of an Iron Curtain that had fallen in eastern Europe from the Baltic in the north to the Adriatic in the south. Lithuania is the Baltic end of that Iron Curtain. The United States has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. It seems to me, however, that something more than stirring words are right and



proper at this time. We have a delegation at the United Nations. We have watched that delegation listen to the Soviet delegates, who have made long and pious speeches about the imperialism of the West. It is time, I think, that we start talking about the imperialism of the East. If a whole new world of African nations are shouting a great cry for freedom, then let them join America in crying for freedom for another small country—Lithuania. It is time, Mr. Speaker, for Adlai Stevenson to bring the freedom of Lithuania as a formal issue before the United Nations so that the newly emerging nations of the world may see not only who are the true imperialists of the 20th century, but, indeed who are the slave masters.

I am proud, today, to join my voice with my colleagues to commemorate the independence of Lithuania. I will be even more proud if this administration will take our words from this national tribunal and will bring them before the international tribunal of the United Nations so that out of this may come, once again, a Lithuania that is free to grow in greatness in the future as she has grown in greatness in the past.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are faced by the threat of war with the Communists in southeast Asia, it is easy to forget about the silent struggle being waged against the tyranny of communism in other countries. February 16 marks Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day which should not be overlooked, because the people of Lithuania need our support and we have much to learn from them.

For many years the Lithuanian people have been forced to submit to the oppressive rule of the Russians. Thousands who resisted were quickly rounded up and liquidated. Russian soldiers still abound in the country, and the Communist political apparatus controls every facet of Lithuanian life. The moment there is a flicker of opposition the power of the whole Soviet Union is brought to bear to destroy it.

In spite of the tyranny under which they live, the brave men and women of Lithuania have not given up the hope of regaining their freedom. We have freedom. We know how it enriches our lives and gives purpose to everything we do.

On this important day, let us make it clear that we stand by the Lithuanian people and that we are making every effort to check the spread of Communist imperialism. Together we will actively work for the day when people everywhere will be able to choose their own way of life.

### House Concurrent Resolution 40

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, there cannot be a true celebration of this independence day by Lithuania since she is still under the domination of the Soviet Union, which took that brave nation by force of arms on June 15, 1940. From that date her people have been enslaved and her lands overrun by leaders of a philosophy which seeks to destroy her heritage of freedom and peace.

We look forward to the day when Lithuania can again take her place among the free nations of the world. To help speed that end, it was my pleasure to introduce again in this Congress House Concurrent Resolution 40, which follows in its entirety:

[89th Cong., 1st sess.]

H. CON. RES. 40

In the House of Representatives, January 4, 1965; Mr. RHODES of Arizona submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, on the other hand, the Baltic nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas no real peace and security can be achieved in the world while Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia remain enslaved by the Soviet Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to bring before the United Nations the question of Soviet action in the Baltic States for the purpose of urging

the United Nations to request that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

(1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

(2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave labor camps in the Soviet Union.

Sec. 2. The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On this date in 1918 Lithuanians were finally able to achieve their longstanding goal of independence. Although the history of Lithuania includes a long series of subjugations by foreign powers, these foreign rulers have never succeeded in breaking the spirit of the Lithuanian people. Whether occupied by German, Polish, Swedish, or Russian forces, Lithuanians have remained faithful to their culture, their history, and their church.

Today this small but valiant country is once again a victim of the curse of foreign domination. In August 1940, Lithuania's 22-year-old independence was completely crushed when the country was taken into the U.S.S.R. as the 14th Soviet Republic. On June 23, 1941, the day after Nazi Germany attacked Russia, Lithuanians again manifested their desire for independence by staging a revolution and again declaring themselves sovereign. The invading Germans ignored the claims of independence and went on to institute a reign of terror and repression. Finally, in the summer of 1944 Lithuania was once more occupied by Soviet troops and reestablished as a component republic of the Soviet Union. Soviet repression and subjugation of Lithuanian national independence continue to this day.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a tragic history. Lithuania is a small nation whose people wish only to live in peace in their own country according to their own principles and traditions. They have not been allowed to do so. The Soviet aggressors have abolished all independent Lithuanian agencies and institutions and dissolved political, religious, cultural, social, and economic organizations. This transformation was accomplished through the use of force, against the will of the citizens of Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have bravely resisted the occupation and sovietization of their nation. Stalinist Russia, however, resorted to terror, deportations, mass arrests, and executions. Using these ruthless methods, Soviet authorities finally overcame

armed Lithuanian resistance. Resistance to the regime still exists, however, and will continue to exist until the restoration of freedom and independence.

The hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere go out to the enslaved people of Lithuania. Long ago our own great nation fought to throw off the chains of foreign domination and we would be untrue to our heritage as Americans if we did not express our earnest hope and prayer that someday Lithuanians, too, will be privileged to live free lives in an independent country. Centuries of foreign domination have not destroyed the Lithuanian people or their desire to be free, and Soviet Russia will be no more successful. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with all Americans on this anniversary of Lithuania's independence in the hope that a free and independent Lithuania may be soon realized.

### James F. McCloud Honored

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a high honor was bestowed on one of my constituents, Mr. James F. McCloud of Oakland, Calif.

"For his most valuable services for the promotion of the work of the church and Catholic Apostleship in Argentina," Mr. McCloud was awarded the title of knight commander in the civil division of the Order of St. Gregory the Great by Pope Paul VI.

Antonio Cardinal Caggiano, head of the Catholic Church in Argentina, decorated Mr. McCloud at a ceremony in Buenos Aires on January 7, 1965, which was witnessed by Mrs. McCloud and their four children. It is significant to note that this is the first time this award has been made in Argentina since its inception in 1831 by Pope Gregory XVII.

Such awards of high distinction, however, are not new to this engineering graduate of the 1941 class of Stanford University. Just last month, Mr. McCloud was named Argentina's Executive of the Year. He is the first U.S. businessman ever to achieve such recognition.

The award was bestowed upon Mr. McCloud, who is president of Industrias Kaiser Argentina—IKA—by the *El Economista* newspaper. Engineer McCloud was cited as "a prototype of the modern executive: young, resolute, possessing a large amount of sensibility, through this entire attitude a need to act is visible, to put into action a creative imagination of notable fertility."

Mr. McCloud, a veteran of 23 years with the Henry J. Kaiser organization, was commended for "his relevant activities and uncommon effort of achievement closely related to the fact that 1964 has been for IKA a truly brilliant year." He

was selected for the honor over a large and highly qualified group of candidates.

These two recent awards recognize years of accomplishment by this American businessman who has done much to demonstrate to Latin Americans the rewards of enlightened capitalism and democratic action.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in bringing Mr. McCloud's achievements to the attention of our colleagues.

### Lithuanian Independence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence our hearts go out to the persecuted Lithuanian people. On this occasion I would like to focus attention upon one phase of the persecution which they have endured since the forced annexation of their country by the Soviet Union during the war—and that is the persecution of religion. Since the Red army occupied Lithuania in a ruthless and calculating manner the Soviet authorities have persistently carried on a campaign to destroy religion, to wipe out every manifestation of it, and to transplant in its stead the atheistic, materialistic philosophy of communism.

Lithuania, a nation rich in religious traditions, prior to the Soviet annexation was largely Roman Catholic with over 80 percent of the population of nearly 3 million adhering to that faith. The remainder was comprised of Lithuanians professing the Lutheran, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox religions. Mindful of the need for a strong religious foundation to insure the moral and ethical vitality of the nation, the Lithuanian people had the wisdom to establish constitutional conditions conducive to the growth of a vigorous religious outlook. In independent Lithuania freedom of religion was guaranteed by the Constitution. Religious groups were free to propagate their faith, conduct religious services, maintain places of public worship, and administer educational institutions. In 1927, a concordat was concluded with the Vatican in which Lithuania established diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Such was the wholesome religious atmosphere in Lithuania in the period following her declaration of independence. Such was the religious character of the Lithuanian nation. By constitutional guarantee, freedom of religion prevailed. In every way the practice of religion and its development within the nation were encouraged. Thus, the Lithuanian people were grounded in a strong and virile religious and moral ethic.

The Soviet conquests of Lithuania in 1940 and again in 1944 have threatened the heart and core of Lithuanian reli-

gious life. As a consequence of the corroding processes of Sovietization the soul of the Lithuanian nation has been exposed to the gravest peril.

Bishop Vincentas Brizgys, the former Roman Catholic bishop of Kaunas and resident of Chicago, has given a vivid account of the extent to which religion is persecuted within so-called Soviet Lithuania. On June 25, 1940, 10 days after the first Soviet occupation of Lithuania, Moscow abrogated the concordat with Rome, and the Papal Nuncio was ordered to leave the country by August 25. Thus the Lithuanian link with the Vatican was broken and the Catholic Church was isolated. Shortly thereafter, Bishop Brizgys stated, all private hospitals, schools, kindergartens, charitable institutions, orphanages, and the like were seized and the personnel arrested by Soviet authorities. Furthermore, the religious press was suppressed within the first week of the occupation; and religious books and other printed matter were banned or destroyed. All seminaries were seized, and monasteries taken over. All bishops and chancery staffs were expelled from their residences. A drive commenced on the observance of religious feast days. And then on April 25, 1941, the teaching of religion was absolutely forbidden throughout the entire nation.

Probably the most ruthless measure taken by the Soviet authorities in their antireligious drive was the attempt to liquidate the clergy. According to Bishop Brizgys, 150 Roman Catholic priests were arrested in Lithuania during the first Soviet occupation. Within 1 year 16 were killed and 6 have since been missing without a trace of their whereabouts. The remainder were liberated by the Lithuanian partisans when the Russo-German war began in June 1941.

When in 1944 Lithuania was again forcibly brought into the Soviet Union, the Soviet military authorities displayed some toleration of religion while the war continued. After the war, however, antireligious measures were again imposed with the same thoroughness and brutality as they were during the first occupation. Bishop Brizgys declared that during the first 2 years after the war 4 Lithuanian Catholic bishops and 89 Lithuanian priests were arrested, and subsequently many additional priests were arrested.

With unrelenting determination the Soviets have continued and even accelerated the process of sovietization in Lithuania. Nor has the Communist attack been solely centered upon the largest religious group, the Roman Catholics. Communism is uniformly hostile in theory and practice to all religions. Only for tactical reasons does it sometimes differentiate between Protestants, Catholics, Jews, or members of the Orthodox church. In Lithuania all religious groups have felt the heavy hand of the Soviet oppressor.

On this 47th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence we of the free world ought to reflect for a moment upon this time of troubles which has come upon the Lithuanian people.



The Lithuanians are a people in jeopardy; they are a people fighting for their identity as a nation; they are a people struggling to keep alive even a spark of their religious spirit.

To this great people, let us, therefore, extend our hand in a symbolic gesture of everlasting friendship; let us raise our voices with those who like ourselves seek justice for the oppressed; and let us join with all the free peoples of the world in prayerful supplication that the soul of Lithuania shall always remain unconquered by its ruthless oppressors.

### Lithuanian Independence: Its Meaning for Us in the Cold War

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 14, 1965, the Lithuanian-Americans of Greater New York gathered at Webster Hall, New York City, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Lithuanian nation.

It was my great privilege to address this group of approximately 1,200 of our Lithuanian friends and to express my hope to them that their fatherland, Lithuania, will once again be free and independent.

In accordance with permission granted to me to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my speech made to this group and to include a resolution which was adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of Greater New York at the gathering.

It is my hope that we can give this resolution strong support and to obtain for the Lithuanian people the freedom and independence they so richly deserve.

The remarks made by me and the resolution adopted follow:

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE: ITS MEANING FOR US IN THE COLD WAR

It is indeed a great privilege and a pleasure to participate in this gathering as we commemorate the 47th anniversary of restoration of independence to Lithuania. I have enjoyed so much the personal contacts with so many of you, that I wanted particularly to be with you today.

The 47th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under new leadership. Let us hope that it will prove to be an era of freedom for all peace-loving nations, including the enslaved nations suffering under the domination of communism and communistic tyranny.

It is easy for peoples such as ourselves to forget the tragedies that have befallen this heroic little country. Caught up in the maelstrom of unfolding history as we are today, pressed on all sides by problems in international and national affairs, and indeed concerned as we must be with the difficult tasks of pursuing life in this very complex modern era, all contribute to an attitude of

mind that tends to regard the events of yesterday a concern only for historians.

But this ought not to be the case. History has lessons for contemporary man, and for us who have taken on such heavy burdens in protecting our interests and those of the free world against communism, the tragedy of Lithuania has a profound and meaningful lesson.

In these next few moments I want to analyze some of the propositions and assumptions that many Americans have today concerning communism and the Soviet Union, and then drawing from the experience of Lithuania, I would like to relate these propositions and assumptions to the reality of recent Lithuanian history.

In our day we hear a great deal about the Soviet concept of "peaceful coexistence." In a veritable outpouring of statements from Moscow, Soviet leaders have assured the Western World that "peaceful coexistence" is the main line of their policy. In a word, they want to live in peace with us, so they say.

Underlying this concept of peaceful coexistence is the assumption, first of all, that the Soviets are trustworthy.

But can they be trusted to keep their word?

We have ample evidence from our own relations with the Soviets to test this assumption. They had pledged in the 1933 agreements on recognition, for example, not to conduct espionage or carry on propaganda activities in the United States. But, history has proven the emptiness of this pledge.

But, what about Lithuania?

Perhaps one of the most significant reliability tests of the Soviet pledged word came with the Soviet invasion and absorption of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. From the early days of the 1920's through the late 1930's the Soviets had concluded numerous agreements with Lithuania in which they solemnly pledged that they would respect the territorial integrity of the nation and respect also its national independence. Yet, despite their pledged word, the Soviets imposed the Mutual Assistance Pact upon Lithuania in the fall of 1939 and with the passing of only a few months invaded and finally absorbed Lithuania into the Soviet Union. This act of treachery was done with utter disregard of the Soviet pledged word, pledges solemnly made in negotiated treaties.

Thus, in this tragic instance we have a classic case study of Soviet disregard of treaty obligations when the politics of a situation or the ideological impulses to expand communism require that those obligations be ignored.

The idea of Soviet ideology and its impact on international relations is also relevant to the Lithuanian experience. In this present climate of artificially inspired "peaceful coexistence" we have been told by some of our most prominent people that ideology has no meaning whatever for the Soviets. These persons argue that we Americans should look at the Soviets in terms of traditional behavior of nation-states—that is, we should disregard the ideological ingredient of Soviet power.

Well, my friends, what can the case of Lithuania tell us on this point?

Had Communist ideology any relevance to Soviet conquest of this territory nation?

Was the conquest of Lithuania a military thrust designed to satisfy deep-rooted ideological Soviet impulses to expand communism?

I would argue for the case that ideology is indeed a substantial factor in estimating the full dimension of Soviet power. It is a factor that one can ignore at his peril.

Here are the facts.

Lithuania was an independent country. Before winning its independence during World War I, it had been for over a century

a part of the Russian Empire. Nevertheless, Lithuania has its own historic past. Lithuanians are a non-Slavic people; their historical experience is rooted in Western rather than Russian civilization; and their culture is similarly Western oriented. In a word, Lithuania is a country totally foreign to Russia. The full span of their history has been marked by an absence of Russian ties, except that of a conquered nation.

Moreover, in 1939, the critical year for all Europe and the world, Lithuania had pledged itself to a policy of neutrality in the fast developing world crisis. It did not act in any manner that could give encouragement to or cause the dissatisfaction of any of the leading contending European powers. Lithuanian policy was directed toward one goal: national survival.

Thus, Lithuania was no threat to the Soviet Union. It provided no cause for alarm in Moscow.

Given these factors, therefore—that is, the lack of historical affinity and the declared national policy of neutrality—how then can one explain the Soviet conquest of that country, Lithuania, and its sister republics?

I frankly do not think that it can be explained in any other way than a manifestation of the Soviet desire to satisfy those deep-seated ideological impulses with the Soviet system and its leaders to expand the domain of communism.

The Soviet leaders and the Communist Party elite are totally committed to the ideology of communism, and their ideology demands of its adherents the continuing expansion of communism's boundaries until at last the ideology itself embraces the whole of mankind.

We should be reminded of this highly important fact today as we search for world peace, as indeed we must. World peace depends upon our ability to reach some sort of agreement, written or unwritten, with the Soviet Union on the futility of thermonuclear war. In so doing, we must ever be wary of the ideological dimension of the Soviet commitment in world affairs. We fall to do so at our peril.

Another assumption that seems to underlay the attitudes of many in their dealings with the Soviet Union is the belief that through the forces of modernity that are at work in the Soviet Union a type of liberalism has taken root and is beginning to assert itself in a way that is permitting a better and more tolerable life for the Soviet people.

Let us test this assumption against the reality of the Lithuanian experience.

There is, of course, no political freedom in Lithuania. Today, the people of Lithuania do not enjoy the freedom and liberty they once knew. Hopes for an evolving democracy in that country were dashed with the Soviet conquest. Today, Lithuania is firmly held within the grip of Soviet totalitarianism. Politically, Lithuania has been forced to take on the structure that exists throughout the entire Soviet Union. The Communist Party in Lithuania is the real source of power, as indeed it is in the other Soviet Republics. The Government itself is nothing more than a convenient administrative facade of constitutional federalism. Lithuanian Communist leaders hold absolute power over the nation, and the Soviet Communist leaders, in turn, hold absolute power over them. But, the people of Lithuania have demonstrated their devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania.

I pay my humble tribute to the valiant fighters for freedom of Lithuania.

The same can be said for the economic and cultural areas of Lithuanian society. The Communist Party, through its monopoly on all sources of power within the state, orders the life of Lithuanians to suit its par-

ticular purposes and those of Moscow. There is no freedom of choice in the cultural realm. Here, Lithuanian writers, poets, and composers must conform to the deadly rubrics of "Socialist realism" that require art not for art's sake, but for the propagation of Communist power. As a result, there can be no flowering of Lithuanian culture as had been during the years of independence.

To repeat, Lithuania is held fast in the grip of Soviet totalitarianism.

Where then is there a possibility for a growing spirit of liberalism or democracy?

I would argue that such a possibility does not exist so long as the Communist monopoly of political power remains. There can be no evolution of this regime into a more tolerable system until vital principles can be taken into account. One of these vital principles is the necessity of dissent, and it is precisely this principle, so important to genuine democracy and liberalism, that is absent in Soviet Lithuania and indeed in the entire Soviet Union.

I seriously question, therefore, this assumption of an improving Soviet society which will produce a qualified form of liberalism. And to those who find merit in this view, I say, "Look to Lithuania."

Yet, there is still another proposition that we Americans hold in our views on foreign policy that has relevance to the Lithuanian experience, and it is based upon our general attitude of the nature of man. We as a people are optimistic. We have a penchant for looking at the brighter side of things.

Let these words of President Franklin D. Roosevelt be a constant reminder to all of us. "It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only been temporarily put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again."

We have great expectations that things will work out in the future, that man is ever progressing toward a new day of freedom and human perfection, and that we as a people will provide the motive power for those who seek freedom. We have, in a word, confidence in the future.

On this occasion, we are reminded that the Russian Communists cannot stop or forbid this program, or similar events that are being held in the United States and throughout the free countries in honor and respect to Lithuania.

We Americans know that this Nation has a generous heart and has always welcomed and assisted exiles and refugees. The goal of the present administration is to nourish independence, to build self-respect, and to breed trust among all nations.

Because this Nation fought for its own independence, it encourages independence for others. However, some of the descendants of the peoples of the enslaved countries appear to be worried about the development of an American policy toward the liberation of these captive nations.

The Democratic Party, at its national convention held in Atlantic City just this past year adopted the following language with respect to enslaved and captive nations. Let me quote the language of that portion of the Democratic platform—"We will encourage by all peaceful means the growing independence of the captive peoples living under communism and hasten the day that Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the other captive nations will achieve full freedom and self-determination."

Let me say to you, that as long as I am a Member of Congress, I shall do whatever I can to bring this declaration to its fulfillment so that these enslaved and captive peo-

ple can live as God meant them to—free and independent.

In our daily tasks in trying to find our way through the intricate maze of foreign affairs in search of our national interest we can again look to the case of Lithuania and to her people for an example of courage, perseverance, and confidence. Even though Lithuania has been a conquered country for the past 25 years, still the Lithuanian people maintain an abiding hope that the future will reward them for the oppression they now so nobly bear. The Soviets have not been able to stamp out their desire for freedom and independence. Condemnation of Lithuanians for their so-called bourgeois nationalism, an ever recurring event in Soviet Lithuania today, testifies to the virility of these people and their dedication to the principles and spirit of national independence. When the Soviets complain vigorously about the continued resistance, so-called survivals of the past and call for a more vigorous antireligious campaign in Lithuania, they expose to the world the truth of Lithuanian attachment to the faith and national culture of their fathers, notwithstanding the extraordinary attempts by Soviet oppressors to destroy these vital sources of national life.

Lithuanians are a people in adversity; and yet far from succumbing to the tyranny of the Soviet Union, they have maintained the integrity of their nation and the inviolability of their national soul. This is a great tribute to the Lithuanian people; and for us in the free world it is an example to which we can point and one from which we ourselves can draw inspiration for the future.

On this 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence it is fitting that we gather here and pay tribute to these gallant and heroic people. On this day we should rededicate ourselves to the spirit of freedom which united the Lithuanian people with the peoples of the world. We know that the Lithuanians will continue to resist the despotism thrust upon them. Their courage, their perseverance, and their loyalty to the historic tradition of their nation will defeat the guns and tanks of their oppressors.

It is also fitting that we reflect upon the virtues and draw from their national experience what inspiration and example we ourselves can use in these trying days.

We should rededicate ourselves to those fundamental principles of freedom and democracy that have lain at the roots of our American heritage for here, in the last analysis, is our supreme glory and the sublime hope of all men for liberty and justice.

Lithuania must be saved, and her independence must be restored and the dignity of the Lithuanian nation must be preserved. On the anniversary of their independence day our prayers are with them that their freedom will not be long in becoming a reality.

#### RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 14, 1965

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 14 of this year of grace 1965 at Webster Hall, New York, N.Y., to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the restoration of the Lithuanian independent state.

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence, her forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union, and her transformation into a Soviet colonial possession;

Recalling the stand taken by both the great political parties of our country as expressed in their electoral platforms of 1964:

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular

challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania of a free exercise of the right to self-determination and for the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

#### Resolve,

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States, firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin, as well as in the United Nations and elsewhere, the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania;

2. To ask the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations dealing with the liquidation of colonialism "in all its forms and implications" to investigate the Soviet colonialism in Lithuania;

3. To urge that the Free Europe Radio extend its broadcast to include the Lithuanian language;

4. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

5. To urge the American Lithuanians to support the policy of the U.S. Government, aiming at the liberation of the Soviet captive nations, and to renew their dedication to the struggle for Lithuania's freedom and independence.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL OF  
GREATER NEW YORK,  
ANTANAS SKERYS, President.  
VIDA RIBOKAS, Secretary.

### Lithuanian Independence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the 47th anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania we are also reminded of the disposition that has kept these brave people from the full realization of their rightful place as a free and independent nation.

Lithuania represents a civilization that was old when the United States came into being and we must shamefacedly confess our selfish preoccupation at the time the Communist colossus moved in to stifle their freedom. And all the while we were fighting a war to stem the Nazi onrush, we were collaborating with an equally ruthless juggernaut that has overrun her weaker neighbors. Added to this is the sad admission that it has become officially taboo to criticize these destroyers of freedom since it might upset the nice balance of peaceful coexistence.

What utter absurdity. How can we preach freedom for all peoples at the very moment we see communistic colonialism flourishing around the world? And we do have a vital stake in Lithuanian independence since our own freedom is only strong when it is predicated on the freedom of all other sovereign peoples. Let us, then, make it our firm



policy to refuse to lend our aid to, or indeed traffic with, any nation that keeps its so-called satellites in thrall.

## Our Foreign Policies and Our Entanglements in Southeast Asia

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to call the attention of my colleagues to, a speech by Indiana's senior Senator, the Honorable R. VANCE HARTKE.

In his address, delivered before the Jacobi Society on February 6, Senator HARTKE offers a deep insight and a profound analysis of our foreign policies and of our entanglements in southeast Asia.

The speech follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE AT THE JACOBI SOCIETY DINNER, STATLER HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 6, 1965

In 1945 President Roosevelt said: "The mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubt and fears, the ignorance and the greed which made this horror possible."

It is in this context that I would like to discuss with you tonight the American role in a seething world, a world in which we have been forced to take the leadership.

Often in recorded history destiny knocks at the door with an iron clang. In our own short time as a nation, history has come to our door 3 times—once when we faced the impossible odds of the British power as we sought our own freedom; a 2d time when President Lincoln sought 75,000 volunteers to preserve the Union; and now in the 20th century when destiny has knocked almost constantly. Through involvement in world affairs brought on by our own success and by the ever-shrinking size of the globe, we have had to take up the task of defending the free world and the very concepts of the Judeo-Christian civilization.

The immediate question is not whether we are to become embroiled in a full-scale major nuclear war which could be the Armageddon of the Bible. Rather, it is a question of what our policies should be to bring lasting peace, freedom, political self-determination, economic development, and personal dignity to the world.

As always, the long-range idealistic goals of our Nation are threatened by an enemy. Aligned against us now is international communism. I agree with President Theodore Roosevelt when he said: "We Americans have many problems to solve, many threatening evils to fight and many deeds to do. If—as we hope and believe—we have the wisdom, the strength, the courage, and the virtue to do them, we must face facts as they are. We must not surrender ourselves to a foolish optimism nor succumb to a timid and ignoble pessimism. Our Nation is the one among all nations of the earth which holds in its hands the fate of the coming years." I believe firmly that we shall succeed."

I am subscribing to the goal of victory for us—for the free world.

In the early years of the Communist international conspiracy, the strategy was to operate from within a country and to promote revolution. The world Communist foreign policy has, in the last 15 years, turned to so-called wars of liberation, while from Moscow have come efforts toward peaceful coexistence.

Thus the Soviet Union has been able to take its seat in peaceful international relations while at the same time appealing to the have-not nations of the world, principally in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The posture of peaceful coexistence has served to allay fears of the neutrals, and to weaken the Western bloc. The so-called wars of liberation have taken a greater toll because we have not always known how to cope with them. Sometimes, we have made serious mistakes with long-term consequences. Sometimes we have vacillated until we were misunderstood or misinterpreted.

The difficulty is compounded because emerging people in newly independent countries see us less in the light of our own Revolution for freedom than they do as allies of those they regard as colonial imperialists.

We must expose the Communists—Russian and Chinese—as the true imperialists they are. And we must learn to distinguish between the ferment of people seeking freedom and the right to control their own destinies free of despotism on the one hand, and the revolutions and infiltrations inspired by Moscow and Peking on the other.

I see little to distinguish the Soviet brand of communism from the Chinese brand. Any competition between the two—in Asia or anywhere else on the globe—can be of little encouragement to us now or in the foreseeable future because it is a competition of deviousness.

The synthesis of our final goals and those of the Communists—as well as this competition of deviousness—is in southeast Asia. At this moment, we are pouring men, material, and money into a place few Americans had heard of a few years ago, in order to meet a commitment to self-determination, to individual freedom, to economic development, and to our own long-term self-interest. On the other side are the Communists.

The active fighters are Asians trained and promoted by the Chinese Reds. Yet, their competitors in deviousness and duplicity are also at work. Russian Premier Alexi Kosygin has gone to Hanoi to show that the Soviet Union also is allied against us.

While we are not alone in Vietnam, having been joined by other SEATO nations including Australia, we are the chief supporters of a South Vietnam that is torn internally.

Since 1954 we have poured nearly \$4 billion into South Vietnam in military and economic aid. That amounts to more than \$266 for each of the 15 million South Vietnamese. Our aid figure today amounts to about \$2 million a day. We have some 21,000 U.S. troops in that beleaguered land. Two hundred Americans have died there and additional hundreds have spilled their blood. More than 125 ships and airplanes of the 7th Fleet are committed to the waters around this peninsula.

How did all this happen? What are we doing in Vietnam?

For a hundred years before World War II, Indochina was a colony of France, ruled by a colonial governor but with representation in the French Assembly. During the war, the Japanese moved in, but when France tried to return, the colonial peoples of the region—which included the present Laos, Cambodia, and both Vietnams—revolted for independence. Nationalist groups wanted permanent independence; Communist-organized groups saw this as the first step toward delivering the whole peninsula into

the Communist camp. But all were united on getting rid of the French.

The Communists were strongest in the area that is now North Vietnam, which is closest to mainland China, from which Chiang Kai-shek had been driven in 1949. In Laos, another Communist force, the Pathet Lao, controlled a large area in the northern part of the country. With outside aid, it seemed very possible that the Communists would achieve dominance.

At the same time, since the revolt against France included not only local Communists but other groups who sought democratic independence, the United States could not intervene on behalf of France without violating our principles of support of colonial people seeking freedom. But John Foster Dulles warned Russia and China against trying to pick up the pieces, even before the French defeat.

Settlement after the fall of the French came in an international conference at Geneva, where on June 21, 1954, agreements were signed to draw a cease-fire line across Vietnam. The northern half became the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, built around Ho Chi Minh's Communist forces, with 17 million people to South Vietnam's 14 million, and with the bulk of the industrial areas. The compromise was supposed to prevent civil war, and provided for a permanent settlement after an all-Vietnam election in July 1956. The situation was very much a parallel to that which created North and South Korea.

Most observers in 1954 felt that Laos and South Vietnam would have a short life, perhaps no more than 6 months, before the Communists took them over. Ngo Dien Diem had become the Premier of South Vietnam 2 weeks before the Geneva agreement. Our problem was to decide whether we should keep hands off, which was the French position, based on belief that it was impossible to save Indochina from the Communists. The other alternative was to give support to Diem, a staunch anti-Communist who had spent many years in the United States.

U.S. advisers and experts were divided. Those who urged help to Diem included Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and John F. Kennedy, who believed Diem could save his country with our help. In September of 1954 the southeast Asia treaty organization came into being, and SEATO was persuaded by Dulles to give Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam guarantees against invasion from North Vietnam. Once the decision was made, we were committed. We could not withdraw. Many say we still cannot without loss of "face."

For 3 years things were relatively quiet. Convinced they could not open direct attack, the Communists reverted to slow infiltration and buildup, especially in Laos. Diem took in nearly 900,000 Vietnamese from the north under a treaty provision which allowed exchange, but only a few left the south. In October 1955, the playboy king, Bao Dai, was ousted and Diem became President of the Republic of South Vietnam. By 1961 South Vietnam had a per capita income of \$110. North Vietnam had only \$70 per person of income. Food production in the north was off 10 percent per capita. In the south, it was up 20 percent.

Part of the credit for the buildup in South Vietnam was clearly ours as we helped train and equip the armies against an expected invasion from the north.

The Chinese, meanwhile, were not to quit. Nor was Russia to fall to exploit the situation.

Infiltration by guerrillas was stepped up from North Vietnam by Chinese Reds while the Soviets fomented trouble in Indonesia and other nearby areas.

Russia sought to paint us as imperialists bent on imposing the white man's rule on

Asians and, just this week, has agreed to supply airplanes to North Vietnam.

There is, of course, great and selfish interest, especially by Red China, apart from embarrassing us. Peiping has compelling reasons for coveting all the countries to the south. Southeast Asia would complement China, which is overpopulated and underfed. Southeast Asia grows more food than it needs. Thailand, for instance, normally is the fourth largest grain exporter in the world.

Of interest to both China and Russia, are these impressive figures on southeast Asia—production of 85 percent of the world's natural rubber, 55 percent of its tin and much of the oil in the Far East.

Future industrial and military power rides on the outcome of the wars on the peninsula of southeast Asia, the former Indochina, now North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Control of the area would place Communists astride sea and air lanes between Indian and Pacific Oceans, between Far East and South Asia.

Should Vietnam fall to communism, Malaysia, Thailand, Burma, and India could soon become victims of aggression. Eventually, Australia could become the target even as it was of the Japanese during World War II.

Ever since the beginning of the guerrilla warfare the United States has been committed by its treaty obligations and by the theory of prior administrations that the rest of the countries will fall should South Vietnam and Laos fall to the Communists. The so-called domino theory.

The true beginnings of this struggle are hard to ferret out. Perhaps, as some say, they go back to our policy in China after World War II. Perhaps, as others say, the policy laid down in Korea of allowing the enemy to escape beyond a certain line is at fault. Perhaps, we have gone too far. Perhaps we have gone not far enough.

Perhaps our negotiated peace in Korea is interpreted as a pattern proving that we do not honor our commitments or that we are a paper tiger.

Perhaps the agreement our Government gave to the neutralist government of Laos is a pattern.

Small wonder, then, that responsible officials of our Government are calling for withdrawal while others are calling for extending the war into North Vietnam and for the bombing of Hanoi and guerrilla supply lines.

Small wonder that the Vietnamese people on our side of the line wonder where we stand.

We have, in our zest to see our allies win, supported successive governments that do not have any popular base to which we say we are committed. And we have, at the same time, declined to extend the war or allow it to be extended. Perhaps both can be justified, in the short term goal of keeping South Vietnam free from communism without touching off the trigger of an atomic war. But these facts and our own conflicting statements about the extent to which we are committed with manpower cause confusion in Vietnam. Remember that we increased our force to some 21,000 from 12,000 at about the time we said we were going to bring 1,000 home. Remember that we have had three Ambassadors in 4 years.

So, while four members of the President's Cabinet offered to replace Henry Cabot Lodge, indicating the importance our Government gives to Vietnam, there is ample cause for wondering in southeast Asia how we intend to reinforce this feeling of importance.

We can wonder, then, whether Sukarno of Indonesia might be less anti-American if he understood what we are doing and where we are headed. Indeed, would he be telling us

to keep our aid if he knew we honor our commitments and are steadfastly proceeding to a goal?

Let me pause a minute to emphasize my own contempt for Mr. Sukarno's attitude and that of Nasser and any others who tell us to jump in the lake.

I have been a supporter of economic and military aid for our allies as a matter of decency, good will, and self-interest. I have supported recent cuts in foreign aid. And I am probably the principal advocate in the Senate of others sharing in the problem of helping underdeveloped countries as well as the principal advocate of private enterprise assistance. Thus, I proposed that NATO countries get into the aid business. And for similar reasons I proposed the new businessmen's peace corps and tax credits for companies that extend their business into underdeveloped countries.

But just as consistent has been my insistence that our aid should neither go to our enemies or to those who bait us and tell us to jump in the lake. I have opposed sending food to Yugoslavia and Poland when they were closely allied with our enemies.

Now I oppose sending food to Indonesia and Egypt and I am the author of a bill to deny all aid to aggressors. My bill predates the recent action by the House to deny food shipments to Egypt because Nasser has seemed to support and—even foment—anti-American actions in his country.

Nasser told America to jump in a lake because he thinks he has us where he wants us.

The Middle East is a powder keg of proportions as great or greater than southeast Asia. Communism, neo-Nazism, age-old rivalries and poverty seethe and ferment in the sands and valleys of the Biblical world. In the background lie trade routes, chemicals, cotton, and oil.

Nasser is at once a stabilizing force and disruptive force. He holds the Arabs together, perhaps preventing all-out war. Yet, he rants and raves against us, against Israel and against our allies. He aids the enemies of peace and freedom in the Congo. He gets arms from the Russians and scientific brains from former German Nazis. He has received economic aid from us and food for peace. He has stood by while our buildings were burned and stoned. And then he told us to keep our aid.

As in Asia, it may be that our long-forgotten policies have caused this mess. It may be that we were too concerned over a latent threat to end our oil concessions. It may be that we were too hasty to stop the British and French from taking the Suez Canal and to stop the Israelis from cleaning out the Sinai Peninsula.

Nevertheless, America has never taken the kind of slap from a head of government that Nasser has accorded us.

The collective frustration of America found expression the other day in the House of Representatives when Congressmen wrote into an appropriations bill a provision that no more food was to be sent to Nasser.

Why, Congressmen and other Americans asked, should we force nations to take our aid when their leaders have told us to keep it? Congress truly was expressing frustrations of Americans.

The authoritative William S. White wrote in his column of January 29:

"It would be a great mistake to suppose that partisan malice was a primary or even major Republican consideration here, just as it would be to suppose that the whole thing sprang from a desire to please American Jews. And other particular friends of Israel.

"Any notion that our foreign policy in the Middle East is run with special tenderness for Jewish feelings is one of the special idiocies of our time.

"The truth is that this Government through the greater part of three administrations has been exceedingly kind to Nasser's Egypt and, in the process, perforce, far from altogether kind to the Israelis, whom he persistently threatens to destroy \* \* \*.

"The truth also is that, while the Israelis are essentially on our side, Nasser consistently plays the international Communist game."

We Americans are slow to anger. We do not simply enter battles with the Communist aggressors for the joy of fighting.

Never in the history of the world has there been affluence such as we in America enjoy today. Never in the history of the world have the storehouses of grain and treasure been opened so fully so long to so many.

Yet we are resented and suspected. Even our benevolence is resented and rejected.

At the same time, courage and determination have earned us respect and friendship in our hours of trial. When President Kennedy blew the whistle on Russia and Cuba during the missile crisis, we won new respect throughout the world both for our President and our Nation. Every Latin American country, including those that had flirted previously with Castro, backed us up. In Africa the Russians were denied use of a landing strip they had financed. The leader of that country told me a few weeks later that landing had been denied because we were right in our dispute with Cuba and they respected our determination and would not let the Russians interfere with our prosecution of our grievance.

A clear statement by our President, backed with the necessary force, earned us respect and new allies during the Cuban crisis.

I believe this has again become necessary in all our foreign affairs, including the Middle East and Far East.

The President has properly been described by both administration spokesmen and other responsible people as the sole architect of our foreign policy. It is, then, clearly his responsibility to spell that policy out in all its ramifications.

Just this week, a man from Indiana was in my office asking: "What is our foreign policy? What are we doing in Vietnam? In Egypt and the whole Middle East? What happened to the tremendous mandate won by Lyndon Johnson last November?"

I replied that the President had laid out a magnificent program for a better life for all Americans, for ridding our Nation of disease and poverty, for greater dignity of the individual and for paring other expenses to the bone. This was use of the mandate.

But my constituent asked again, "Why then does he not lay down an equally imaginative program for winning the cold war? For meeting the goals in the world?"

I explained to my constituent—and I now explain to you—the President's background. He was probably the greatest majority leader in the history of our land. He led by welding divergent elements and interests in the Senate into an effective coalition.

It was natural, then, that as President, he would again lead by bringing divergent elements together. The technique has become known as leading through consensus. It has worked effectively with domestic programs and it resulted in the overwhelming victory of November 3. Leadership by consensus cannot be applied to foreign policy.

Yet, the President can and must use the reservoir of good will obtained through his amazing consensus at home to lead us and direct us abroad. As my constituent correctly pointed out, President Johnson enjoys unparalleled popularity among the people of America and a tremendous mandate to lead. Our country has, likewise, a reservoir of good will similar to that which we found available to us in the Cuban crisis when unknown allies leaped to our side.



President Johnson must dip into both these reservoirs and use them to point the way. He must clearly enunciate his goals and how he intends to reach them. In this way, and only in this way, will he obtain the support he needs to bring us the eventual victory.

The President should and must tell America, first, and the rest of the world what our posture is; what our aims are; what our interests and commitments are; how we intend to meet these commitments. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do in Vietnam. We need to know how the President plans to handle Nasser and Sukarno and others who may tell us off. He must tell Americans how they must serve the cause of freedom and peace.

America has both power and mercy. It has, in recent months, demonstrated both.

Yet, vacillation and indecision can be confused with weakness. Discussion of alternatives in Vietnam can, in the absence of clear policy, from the architect of policy, be mistaken for strife.

The time has come for us to be both American and Churchillian in our approach to these problems and to their eventual solution.

The President is more than capable of this role of leadership with strength and determination. He must now map out the road ahead, tell us what vehicles to use and then lead us up the road.

This is essential to American leadership in a hostile world.

We in America have the maturity, the moral fiber, the brains, the courage, the wealth and the power to carry out a policy of honesty, integrity, and devotion to peace and freedom.

Ultimately we shall triumph. We shall win a lasting victory for lasting peace, honor, and freedom.

We shall win it with a great President who clearly defines the role of each and all of us and who will lead us to the victory.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was 47 years ago today that the Lithuanian people, who had lived for centuries under alien rule, proclaimed their independence and proceeded with the vigor that is characteristic of these people to improve and promote their social

and economic welfare. Their efforts won the admiration of the free world and served as an example of what freemen can do.

With great sorrow we recall that the independence of this nation did not endure for long. The invasion of Red army forces in 1940 brought unparalleled oppression, persecution, and tyranny and the forceful incorporation of the republic into the U.S.S.R.

The plight of the Lithuanian people—and, indeed, of all people who have been forcibly enslaved—should be of concern to all who cherish freedom. In commemorating this day of Lithuanian independence, we pay tribute to the courage of these people and their undying faith in eventual release. Their strength of character and their devotion to the high ideals of mankind will certainly prevail and will again bring them the freedom they so richly deserve.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today marks another anniversary for a small but gallant nation—another anniversary observed in sadness. Forty-seven years ago, on February 16, the courageous people of Lithuania won their independence and for 22 years enjoyed a happy, free, and democratic way of life. Now this independence is only a memory, but it remains a cherished dream for millions of Lithuanians now behind the Iron Curtain and for their countrymen in America and throughout the world.

It is a privilege to join with my colleagues in the House in paying well-deserved tribute to the valiant people of Lithuania on this occasion, for as long as we here in America have the will to remember and to care, their hopes for liberation will be kept alive. I am confident that the people of Lithuania will one day regain their freedom, for they are a nation of Christian traditions with the faith to persevere. But we in the free world must give them the encourage-

ment to continue the fight. We must continue to support their cause and do what we can to aid in winning back their national identity and independence. We can let them know that America still stands devoted, as they do, to the principles of justice and the right of self-determination.

All who cherish freedom in the world have a common interest, and likewise we share a common threat. Lithuanian Independence Day, therefore, should be for Americans a day of prayerful reflection and renewed dedication. In this regard, I personally am today introducing a House concurrent resolution calling on the President of the United States to instruct the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to take certain action in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

I know the people of my district join me in saluting the wonderful people of Lithuania and also in expressing the hope that soon, February 16 will once again be truly a day of independence for them and for all captive nations now behind the Iron Curtain. It will then be a happy day for all of us.

### Lithuanian Independence Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects today to the people of Lithuania on this the 47th anniversary of the restoration of their independence in 1918.

Unfortunately, that independence has once again succumbed to the advance of Russian tyranny. Lithuania has not known freedom since the early days of World War II. But I am confident that Lithuania's day of freedom will come again. The unflagging determination of Lithuanian-Americans throughout this country to keep the plight of Lithuania before the eyes of the world convinces me that freedom and Lithuania can never long be strangers.

Let us all join with Lithuanian-Americans in today making our own commitments to the cause of freedom everywhere.